

# The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, APRIL 2, 1881.

## CONTENTS.

CURRENT TOPICS .....	401
CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS FOR LIBEL .....	403
TRUST SECURITIES PAYABLE TO BEARER .....	404
REVIEWS .....	405
CORRESPONDENCE .....	406
CASES OF THE WEEK:—	
The Plating Company v. Farquharson .....	406
Ex parte Wicks .....	407
Ex parte Bacon .....	407
Pike v. Fitzgibbon .....	407
Ex parte Evans .....	408
Re Grundy, Kershaw, & Co .....	408
SOLICITORS' CASES .....	409
THE SOLICITORS' REMUNERATION BILL .....	409
SOCIETIES .....	410
LEGAL APPOINTMENTS .....	412
COMPANIES .....	412
BUSINESS AT WESTMINSTER .....	413
OBITUARY .....	413
CREDITORS' CLAIMS .....	413
LEGISLATION OF THE WEEK .....	415
COURT PAPERS .....	415
LONDON GAZETTES, &c., &c. ....	416

## CASES REPORTED IN THE WEEKLY REPORTER.

Arkwright v. Newbold (App.) .....	455
Ball v. Warwick (Q.B.Div.) .....	468
Birchall, In re. Wilson v. Birchall (Ch.Div. V.C.M.) .....	461
Bruce v. Bruce and Laing (Div.Div.) .....	474
Burnand v. Rodocanachi (App.) .....	460
Emmet In re. Emmet v. Emmet (Ch.Div. V.C.H.) .....	464
Finch, In re. Abbess v. Burney (App.) .....	449
Forster v. Patterson (Ch.Div. V.C.B.) .....	463
Gould and others, Appellants; The Bacon Local Board, Respondents (Q.B.D.) .....	471
Guardians of the Poor of the Fulham Union, The, Appellants, v. The Guardians of the Poor of the Isle of Thanet Union, Respondents (Q.B.Div.) .....	470
Holland, In re (Lun.) .....	440
Hope v. Ewing (Prob.Div.) .....	474
Leman v. The Yorkshire Wagon Company (Limited) (Ch.Div. V.C.H.) .....	466
Lloyd's v. Harper (App.) .....	453
McMahon v. Field (Ex.Div.) .....	472
Orpen, In re. Beswick v. Orpen (Ch.Div. V.C.H.) .....	467
Queen, The, v. Willshire (C.C.R.) .....	473
"Radnorshire," The (Adm.Div.) .....	476
Trustees of Bishop Monk's Horfield Trust, Ex parte, The (Ch.Div. V.C.M.) .....	462
Wilkinson & Co. v. Unwin (App.) .....	458
Yeatman, Ex parte. Re Yeatman (App.) .....	457

## CURRENT TOPICS.

MR. JUSTICE KAY will take his seat on the bench on Monday next, in the court recently occupied by Vice-Chancellor MALINS.

IT IS SETTLED that the leaders attached to the court of Mr. Justice FRY will continue to practise before his lordship as successor to Vice-Chancellor MALINS.

THE COSTS on both sides of the second trial in *Chamberlaine v. Barnwell* are stated to have amounted to about £400 a day. As the trial lasted fifteen days, this represents an outlay of about £6,000, in addition to the costs of the previous trial.

AN ORDER OF TRANSFER will be made of thirty causes from Mr. Justice FRY, and twenty from Vice-Chancellor

HALL, to Mr. Justice KAY, for the purpose of hearing only. We believe that the causes to be transferred from Mr. Justice FRY's list will be placed at the head of Mr. Justice KAY's list, and that they will commence with the case of *Elers v. Harvey*.

IN SUBSTITUTION for the order of June 19, 1877, which was discharged by the order of the 23rd of March last (*ante*, page 389), an order will be made directing that each of the several causes which shall be transferred to Mr. Justice KAY shall, until further order, be deemed to have been transferred to him for the purpose only of trial or of hearing, and that no cause or matter shall, until further order, be assigned to Mr. Justice KAY by the same being marked by the plaintiff or petitioner with the name of Mr. Justice KAY.

MR. E. E. KAY has had a large experience of business both as junior and leader, and will, we believe, justify his appointment as a judge of the Chancery Division, although, owing to some asperity of manner, he has not achieved much popularity among his professional brethren. We have, however, heard the opinion expressed by persons of experience that frequently the manner which it pleases leaders to adopt towards their juniors and clients is merely assumed to protect them against the waste of time to which good nature, if undisguised, might expose them; and that the apparent alteration in disposition which some leaders who have adopted this method of protection show when they have ascended to the bench is not really a change of character, but only an abandonment of a protection which is no longer necessary. Probably Mr. Justice KAY will afford an instance of the truth of this remark.

THERE ARE SYMPTOMS of dissatisfaction with the Solicitors' Remuneration Bill, which we regret to see are taking the form of opposition to its passing into law. The Liverpool Law Society have issued an elaborate report on the Bill, in which they state that, "while on the whole they approve of the measure," they object to the principle of charging by scale being applied to settlements; to the scale of fees including disbursements, and particularly to the fact that the scale is not set out in the Bill. The society have presented a petition to Parliament praying that on these grounds the Bill should not pass into law. We think this a grave mistake. If the society, as they state, approve of the general principle of the Bill, the proper course to be taken, in order to obtain amendments in detail, is to bring the united action of the profession, through the Incorporated Law Society and the Associated Provincial Law Societies, to bear on those in charge of the Bill and members of the House, while the Bill is in Committee. Nothing can be gained by isolated action with regard to a Bill of this kind, and it is not likely that a better opportunity will ever occur than at present is afforded of obtaining a satisfactory measure.

WHATEVER MAY BE THOUGHT of the expediency of the prosecution of the *Freiheit*, or of the conduct of the police in executing the warrant, there appears to be ground for supposing that in proceeding against the proprietor of that paper for a libel which, although relating

mainly to the Emperor of Russia, is alleged to have incited to the assassination of the Emperor of Germany, the Government are only fulfilling the obligations of international law. Although a State has a right to harbour political refugees, it cannot, consistently with the obligations of friendship with other States, allow them to plot against the person of the Sovereign, or the institutions, of their native country. Crimes of this kind do not call for extradition, but should be punished by the laws of the country to which the refugees have fled (Woolsey, § 79). The rule is clearly laid down by Bluntschli (*Droit International Codifié*, § 396):—"The State should protect the refugees against pursuit; but it ought not to afford them a basis of operations for continuing their political offences."

WITH REGARD to the form of the charge against the publisher of the *Freiheit*—viz., that of publishing a libel on a foreign Sovereign—there appears to be no doubt that libels tending to disturb the amicable relations between this country and other nations, by malicious reflections on those who are possessed of high rank and influence in foreign States, are punishable at common law. Thus, Lord ELLENBOROUGH laid it down in *Peltier's case* (28 Howell's State Trials, 617), that "any publication which tends to degrade, revile, and defame persons in considerable positions of power and dignity in foreign countries, may be taken to be, and treated as, a libel; and particularly when it has a tendency to interrupt the pacific relations between the two countries." Moreover, a precedent curiously applicable to the present circumstances exists in *R. v. Vint* (27 Howell's State Trials, 627). In that case JOHN VINT was found guilty upon an information charging him with having published the following libel:—"The Emperor of Russia is rendering himself obnoxious to his subjects by various acts of tyranny, and ridiculous in the eyes of Europe by his inconsistency; he has lately framed an edict to prohibit the exportation of deals and other naval stores. In consequence of this ill-judged law, a hundred sail of vessels are likely to return to this country without their freight."

THE ILL-DRAFTED BILL to amend the Bills of Sale Act 1878, on which we commented last year, has again made its appearance in the House of Commons. So far as we have observed, none of the errors on which we remarked have been remedied. We do not propose to go over them again, but attention should be drawn to clause 7, which proposes to provide that "from and after the commencement of this Act a solicitor of the Supreme Court attesting a bill of sale shall, before the execution thereof, explain its full meaning and effect to the grantor." This attempt to carry into effect the doctrine laid down by Vice-Chancellor MALINS in *Hill v. Kirkwood* (24 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 304) should be strenuously resisted by the profession. How will it be possible to make sure that the "full meaning and effect" of a bill of sale have been explained so as to satisfy a judge? In *Hill v. Kirkwood* the Vice-Chancellor said that a solicitor who explained the meaning of a bill of sale "in general terms" did not do his duty. "Did you," he asked, "explain that the plaintiffs could not take a sheep or lamb off the farm and sell it at Doncaster Market in the ordinary course of farming business, and that the defendants could, at any moment, enter into possession and sell up the plaintiffs?" So far as we can gather from the Bill, it does not seem to be intended that the bill of sale shall be void if the solicitor fails to explain its "full meaning and effect" to the grantor; but the solicitor would, doubtless, be liable in such a case to be punished under the summary jurisdiction of the court.

SINCE THE NIGHT of Sunday next is the time fixed for taking the census of the United Kingdom, we may remind our readers of some of the leading provisions of the Census Act of last year (43 & 44 Vict. c. 37). By section 1 the forms and instructions issued by the Registrar-General are to be such as the Local Government Board "shall deem necessary." By section 4, the registrars in England are to "leave or cause to be left at every dwelling-house within their respective sub-districts" schedules "for the purpose of being filled up by or on behalf of the several occupiers of dwelling-houses" with particulars of the name, sex, age, rank, profession, or occupation, condition as to marriage, relation to head of family, and birthplace of every living person who abode in every house on the night of Sunday the 3rd of April, 1881, and also whether any were blind, or deaf and dumb, or imbecile, or lunatic." Where a dwelling-house is let or sub-let in different stories or apartments, and occupied distinctly by different persons or families, a schedule is to be filled up by the occupier of each distinct story or apartment. Every occupier is to fill up the schedule "to the best of his or her knowledge or belief so far as relates to all persons dwelling in the house, story, or apartment," and to sign his or her name thereunto. A penalty of not more than £5, nor less than £1 (recoverable before two justices), is imposed upon every occupier "who shall wilfully refuse or without lawful cause neglect to fill up the said schedule to the best of his or her knowledge or belief, or to sign and deliver the same, . . . or who shall wilfully make, sign, or deliver, or cause to be made, signed, or delivered, any false return of all or any of the matters specified in the said schedule." Section 5 gives the enumerators extensive powers of revision, for they are to "complete such of the said schedules as upon delivery thereof to them shall appear to be defective, and correct such as they shall find to be erroneous." Section 17 also confers some inquisitorial powers, for the enumerators and other persons employed in the execution of the Act are authorized to ask all questions directed in the instructions of the Local Government Board which are necessary for obtaining the returns required, and every person "refusing to answer or wilfully give a false answer to" any such question, is subjected to a penalty of from £1 to £5.

WE ARE GLAD to observe that Mr. Justice HAWKINS has remitted the fine of £10 which he recently imposed on the plaintiff who, on the learned judge depriving him of his costs, inasmuch as he ought to have brought his action in the county court, remarked, "That's a rum thing, too"—whether reflecting upon counsel's application; upon the policy of the Legislature in passing the 5th section of the County Courts Act, 1867; upon the conflicting judicial interpretations of that section; or upon the application of the section by the judge, does not appear. There is little doubt that a technical contempt of court had been committed, but it seems clear that no disrespect to the court was intended, and that the remark was only that of a man who had been so carried away by his interest in the case as to express his thoughts aloud. It may be observed that the lesser and less usual punishment for contempt, by fine only, is not so easily exacted from the offender as the greater and more usual punishment by fine coupled with imprisonment, which frequently takes the form of imprisonment only until the fine is paid. In this latter case the officer of the court may immediately arrest the offender, who, by apology or payment of the fine, or both, "purges" his contempt. Where a fine only is inflicted, we presume that it becomes a debt to the Crown, recoverable by the tedious process of "English Information" under the Crown Suits Act, 1865.

A CORRESPONDENT sends us the following advertisement which appeared in a recent issue of a daily paper,

and which, as he remarks, is certainly a novelty:—"Law.—To Barristers Commencing Practice.—The Nucleus of a sound Business can be secured by the advance of about £500 for an agreed term. Address, in confidence, —" We hope and believe that this advertiser will receive no response. Probably no body of men has ever preserved and enforced so successfully as the English bar the rule which prohibits tradesmanlike buying of custom, touting, advertising, and underbidding; and the result is to be seen in the class of men who have been attracted to its ranks, and in the honourable and independent position it has maintained in the country. It may be doubted, however, whether in these days of decentralization, when the members are thrown far less together than formerly, there exist sufficient means for detecting and discouraging infringements of the traditional etiquette; and it has been suggested that the benchers of the Inns of Court would do well to appoint a joint committee to inquire into the matter.

AS WE POINTED OUT when the question was first raised, and for the reasons which we pointed out, the Court of Appeal has affirmed the judgment of Mr. Justice MATHEW to the effect that Mr. BRADLAUGH was not entitled to affirm under the Parliamentary Oaths Act. Shortly put, the *ratio decidendi* is that Mr. BRADLAUGH is not "another person" *ejusdem generis* with a Quaker, Separatist, Moravian, or like persons who from time to time have been allowed to substitute an affirmation for an oath, not on the ground of having no religious belief at all, but having a religious belief very actively developed. Mr. BRADLAUGH appeals to the House of Lords, but it can hardly be expected that on the main point—upon which every argument was urged—the House will reverse the decision of the Court of Appeal. Upon the technical question, however—scarcely raised before Mr. Justice MATHEW—whether a common informer or only the Crown can sue for the penalty, there is a little room for doubt; and, indeed, Lord Justice BRAMWELL expressed some hesitation upon it. The words of the Parliamentary Oaths Act are to the effect that the member not properly affirming "shall for every such offence be subject to a penalty of five hundred pounds, to be recovered by action in one of her Majesty's superior courts of Westminster." It appears to be undoubted law that, where a penalty is not expressly or impliedly given to a subject, only the Crown can sue for it (see *Com. Dig. tit. Forfeiture C*). But it is also said that such a penalty must be sued for in the Exchequer (*R. v. Malland, Str. 828*); and inasmuch as the statute gives three courts wherein to sue, and as the Crown usually proceeds by information, not action, the court held that the words "by any person who shall sue for the same" are to be read into the statute, and that the right of the subject to the penalty is impliedly given. It is with much diffidence that we throw a doubt upon reasoning which has convinced so strong a Court of Appeal; but it may be worth while to point out that there has been a slight departure from the rule that a penal statute is to be construed strictly in favour of defendants, not of plaintiffs, and to suggest that the words "by a party grieved" might be read into the statute after the word "recoverable," with perhaps a little less violence than the words "by any person who shall sue for the same." It is in conformity with the practice under the Parliamentary Elections Act, 1868, and we think also, with general principles of law, that the legal interest in procuring a member to be unseated is not vested in all the world, but in his constituents, or in his opponents at a particular election.

## CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS FOR LIBEL.

It seems to us a very doubtful question, to judge from recent experience, whether, in all cases of libel, it should be open to the party libelled to proceed by way of criminal prosecution. The theory of the law on the subject is that a libel is a criminal offence, not on account of the wrong done to the individual's reputation, but because of its tendency to lead to a breach of the peace. Accordingly, as the law originally stood, in criminal prosecutions the truth of the libel was no defence. The severity of the ancient law in this respect has been modified by the statutory provision which enables the defendant to plead that the libel was true, and that it was for the public good that it should be published. It appears to us that the ancient theory which made the criminality of a libel depend on its tendency to produce a breach of the peace cannot, in its integrity, be supported as a reasonable theory of the law. If this be the theory of the thing, the fact that the publication of the libel was for the public good is immaterial. That fact does not at all diminish or affect the tendency of the libel to lead to a breach of the peace. Again, what would otherwise be libellous may not be so, on the ground that it is a fair comment or criticism on a matter of public interest; but the irritable author, whose production has been condemned, is none the more likely on that account to abstain from horsewhipping the editor or the critic, if he would otherwise be disposed so to do.

It seems to us that the protection of the public from attacks upon the reputation is the real ground of the criminality of libel. It is an analogous case to that of an assault, which may be the foundation of an action or of an indictment at the election of the party assaulted. The attack on the person and on the reputation are similar in this respect. In an action the object is mainly to compensate the individual; in the case of an indictment the object is the protection of the public from similar attacks. There can be no doubt that it is essential to the protection of the public that libel should be a crime. Private malice and the appetite for scandal, which makes defamation a profitable pursuit, would otherwise, in many cases, be subject to no counteracting influence. An action can only be effectual where the party sued is a substantial person. The ostensible conductors of scurrilous newspapers are frequently men of straw. Again, if pecuniary damages were the only remedy, a man of wealth might be willing to buy, however dearly, the gratification of defaming his enemy. It is, therefore, inevitable that libel should be ranked among crimes.

But very often it must occur to any impartial person that cases which form the subject of a prosecution for libel would much more appropriately have formed the subject of a civil action. We do not wish to be regarded as speaking with respect to any particular case, but generally. We cannot help thinking that it is desirable in the interests of the public that there should be some limitation upon the power of a person who has been libelled to proceed by way of public prosecution. There are cases in which the libel is so malicious and outrageous; the conduct of the libeller shows such an obvious defiance of law, and contempt for the rights of the individual, that in the interests of the public the libel is obviously a proper subject of criminal prosecution, or no one's reputation would be safe; on the other hand, there are cases in which the libel is so much more excusable, or even almost justifiable, that it would be obviously inappropriate to place it within the category of crimes; for instance, a man in the course of some private difference may have made unguarded statements which he cannot prove in correspondence with some third party, under circumstances which do not amount to privilege, but which palliate and almost justify his conduct in a court of conscience if not of law; a man as a public critic may have been misled into making comments, the severity of

The Newcastle-upon-Tyne Incorporated Law Society have petitioned the House of Commons in favour of the Solicitors' Remuneration Bill.



which he cannot altogether justify; or again, the conduct of the party libelled may have been so provocative of the libel that it is obvious that he has no *locus standi* to appear in the name of her Majesty as the vindicator of the public against defamation. Then, of course, as is the case with other similar matters, there are cases nearer the line, in which it is more difficult to discriminate and to say whether the particular libel ranges itself under the head of crime or mere civil injury. But we cannot help thinking that the province of discriminating ought not to be left entirely to private and personal judgment.

The need of some judicial mode of discrimination has been intensified by the course of recent decisions. In the case of *The Queen v. Carden* (28 W. R. 133, L. R. 5 Q. B. D. 1), it was held that the province of a magistrate upon a preliminary inquiry upon an information for publishing a libel was merely to ascertain whether there were *prima facie* grounds for believing that a libel had been published, and that he could not receive evidence of the truth of the libel under Lord Campbell's Act. We do not find fault with this decision, though it appeared to us that the point was a very doubtful one. We do not think a magistrate ought to be compelled to sit and have the question of the truth of the libel tried out before him when he is quite clear that the matter ought to go before another tribunal. But it does seem to us that the effect of the decision is to leave the application of the criminal law for the purposes of private vengeance still more unfettered than it was before.

We feel that there is considerable difficulty in devising a remedy, but we do think that it would be well if some preliminary authorization were necessary to a prosecution for libel, and that it should be open to the tribunal, charged with the duty of granting or withholding such authorization, to decide whether a *prima facie* case was made out for the application of the criminal law, having regard to the general aspect of the case. In the case of criminal informations for libel, a rule for the criminal information has to be obtained, against which the proposed defendant can show cause. This might or might not be thought a suitable safeguard in the case of ordinary indictments for libel. We do not pledge ourselves to the recommendation of any particular mode of effecting the desired object. Possibly it would be desirable to give the magistrate a general jurisdiction to consider the point whether, even assuming that there had been a libel, on the whole, the case was a fit subject for indictment. Some machinery of this nature, however, we really think there ought to be.

## TRUST SECURITIES PAYABLE TO BEARER.

Most foreign and colonial Government securities are made payable to bearer, and cannot be inscribed in any books or registers in the names of the holders. The comparatively high rate of interest which may be obtained on many of these investments leads to applications to trustees by their *cestui que trust* to invest the trust funds upon them, and the question not unfrequently arises whether trustees are justified in complying with these requests. The answer to the question is, in many cases, not free from difficulty.

Before, however, we consider the question of investments made by trustees in bonds payable to bearer and passing by delivery, it may be well to clear the ground by dealing, first, with the question of whether trustees are justified in retaining such investments made by the testator or creator of the trust. They can, of course, only do so by virtue of an authority contained in the will or trust deed. Of course, where a testator expressly directs certain specified securities payable to bearer to be retained by his trustees, they will be justified in retaining

them. Thus, in *Mendes v. Guedalla* (2 J. & H. 259), a testator directed that, unless his trustees should see any very pressing reason to the contrary, so much of the testator's personal estate as should consist of Spanish bonds should be retained by his trustees for the time being, and should not be sold or converted under the general direction thereinbefore contained in that behalf, until £50 at the least could be obtained for each bond of £100. The Spanish bonds belonging to the testator were payable to bearer and passed by delivery. It was assumed by the court that the trustees were justified in retaining the bonds. So also where the testator, although not specifying the particular bonds, clearly shows an intention that all his Government bonds shall be retained, the court will hold that the direction includes bonds payable to bearer and passing by delivery. Thus in *Arnould v. Grinstead* (*Weekly Notes*, 1872, 216), a testator directed that all his personal property "invested in Government or other securities, in bonds or shares, of whatever nature or kind, be held in the same or the like investments." The personal property of the testator was invested in securities most of which were payable to bearer, and it was contended, for persons interested in remainder, that these investments were unauthorized and unsafe. Vice-Chancellor Bacon, however, said that the securities on which the trust fund were invested could not be altered without violating the plain and positive directions of the will, and accordingly held that the investments were proper investments. We are not aware of any other reported case on this subject, but in an unreported case of *Re the Trusts of Lord Broughton's Will*, heard before Vice-Chancellor Hall, on 25th of July, 1879,\* trustees were authorized to retain these investments upon much less plain and positive directions. The testator authorized his trustees to appropriate and set apart towards payment of a certain trust legacy bequeathed by his will "any mortgages or other securities" of which he might be possessed at the time of his death. The trustees having set apart, among other investments, some Canada bonds payable to bearer held by the testator, Vice-Chancellor Hall held that the trustees were justified in retaining these bonds. On the other hand, in another unreported case of *Re Skinner*, before the Master of the Rolls on the 14th of June, 1879,† the question arose with reference to the usual direction as to investment in a marriage settlement of personality, that the trustees "should be possessed of the said stocks so transferred as aforesaid upon trust that they should either permit the whole or any part of the same to remain in their then respective actual state of investment," or with the consent in writing of the husband and wife, or the survivor, and after the decease of the survivor, at the discretion of the trustees, should sell the same. Some of the settled funds were invested in Turkish, English, and Austrian bonds, payable to bearer, and upon a petition by the trustees for the advice of the court as to whether they were justified in retaining these investments, the Master of the Rolls answered the question in the negative. The trustees, he said, would not be justified in retaining the investments already made in bonds payable to bearer, and transferable by delivery. Probably in this state of the authorities, the only safe advice that can be given to trustees is that, in order to justify trustees in retaining investments of this description made by the testator or creator of the trust, there must be some reference in the will or trust deed, either to the particular investments to be retained, or to the general class of investments of which they form part.

With regard to the power of trustees to invest in these securities, there has also been some conflict of opinion. In *Lewis v. Nobbs* (L. R. 8 Ch. D. 591), a testator gave the residue of his estate to trustees on trust to invest in Parliamentary stocks or funds, or upon real securities,

\* *Solicitors*, Messrs. Phelps & Woodford.

† *Solicitors*, Messrs. Johnsons & Co.



and the will contained a proviso that as often as the trustees should think it expedient so to do, they might sell out, transfer, and otherwise vary any of the trust moneys, funds, and securities, and invest the same in or on any other funds or securities whatsoever. The trustees sold out New Three per Cents., and invested the proceeds in Russian railway and Egyptian bonds. The Russian bonds were transferable by delivery. Vice-Chancellor Hall held that the trustees were authorized to invest the trust funds in the bonds. And in the above-mentioned case of *Re the Trusts of Lord Broughton's Will*, Vice-Chancellor Hall held that under a direction to invest the testator's residuary personal estate "in their or his names or name," in or upon (*inter alia*) "the loans, notes, debentures, stocks, or other securities . . . of any British colony, or foreign Government or State," the trustees might properly invest trust moneys on bonds payable to bearer and transferable by delivery. On the other hand, in the above-mentioned case of *Re Skinner*, under a trust to invest in the "public funds of . . . any colony or dependency of Great Britain, or in the public funds of any foreign Government," the Master of the Rolls held that the trustees would not be justified in making any investment in foreign Government bonds payable to bearer.

As to the duties of trustees where the trust funds comprise securities payable to bearer and passing by delivery, and the interest upon which is payable by coupons attached to the bonds, the judgment of Vice-Chancellor Wood in the above-mentioned case of *Mendes v. Guedalla* contains a clear statement of the doctrine of the court. The three trustees in that case deposited a box containing the bonds payable to bearer with their bankers in trust for all three trustees, and the learned judge said (p. 277), "I do not see what better course the trustees could have adopted for the protection of the property. . . . With regard to property of that description (whether it be a plate chest, or whatever it may be), I know of no better course to take for protecting it than to deposit it at your bankers. It must be deposited somewhere. It cannot be in three houses at once. The only other course which suggested itself to me was to deposit it in a box with three locks, opened by three different keys, one to be kept by each of the three trustees; so that the box could not be opened without the permission of all the trustees. But where the interest of property is payable upon coupons, and twice a year, and the box must be opened twice a year for the purpose of obtaining access to the coupons, it is too much to say that a man of ordinary prudence in the management of his affairs would think it necessary, for the protection of his property, to adopt a course of that kind—knowing, as he would, that it would be the banker's duty to see that the coupons only were taken out of the box on each occasion, and that neither the box itself nor the securities were removed." It also appears from this case that there will be no irregularity in one of the trustees being intrusted with the key; for someone must be so intrusted in order to get access half-yearly to the coupons, and there is no person to whom it can be intrusted for that purpose with greater propriety than one of the trustees.

On the 25th ult., Mr. Justice Fry, upon taking his seat, alluded to the order recently made by the Lord Chancellor referring to the resignation of Sir Richard Malins, and transferring all causes and matters pending before him to his court (which we printed last week), and said he wished to have the assistance of the leaders of the bar in arranging the course of business in the court. After some discussion, his lordship decided upon taking motions, adjourned summonses, and non-witness causes on Thursdays; and short causes, petitions, adjourned summonses, and non-witness causes on Fridays and Saturdays. This would leave the first three days of the week for the regular cause list. Subsequently his lordship stated for the information of the bar that after Easter he would move into the court recently occupied by Vice-Chancellor Malins.

## REVIEWS.

### MUNICIPAL CORPORATION ACTS.

RAWLINSON'S MUNICIPAL CORPORATION ACTS. SEVENTH EDITION. By THOMAS GEARY, Esq., Barrister-at-Law. W. Maxwell & Son.

The sixth edition of this work was published in 1874. The statutes affecting municipal corporations which have been passed since that date are so numerous (Mr. Geary prints seventeen) and important, that we are not surprised to learn that the present edition has long been required. The Local Loans Act, 1875, the Municipal Elections Act, 1875, the New Charters Act, 1877, the Parliamentary and Municipal Registration Act, 1878—any of these four might have been thought to necessitate a new edition of itself. A very sensible reason, however, for the delay is given in the preface. It appears that the late Government brought in "a Bill for the consolidation of all the municipal corporation statutes, but took no steps whatever with regard to this Bill beyond bringing it in each session, and it seems now to be quietly dropped."

Passing to the mode in which the new statutes have dealt with, we cannot but think a better mode of arrangement would have been to print the Municipal Acts proper by themselves, and the supplementary Acts in the appendix, with which the book has always concluded. The Prison Act, 1877, the Justices' Clerks Act, 1877, and the Adulteration Act, 1879, come rather awkwardly in the principal part of the book. In connection with the New Charters Act, 1877, we should have looked for a little practical information as to the mode of procuring a charter, and a list of municipal boroughs incorporated since 1835 might surely have been given. We think that the schedule to the Municipal Elections Act, 1875, ought to have been provided with editorial marginal notes, and that both the 313th section of the Public Health Act, 1875, and the rules for meetings of ratepayers, contained in the third schedule of the Public Health Act, and substituted by section 313 for sections 12 and 13 of the Local Government Act, ought to have been printed at length in the note to 35 & 36 Vict. c. 91, s. 4, which incorporates the sections of the Local Government Act above named.

With regard to the cases, we have searched for many, and missed none, and the notes are always clearly and neatly expressed. The "condensation" which the editor speaks of in the preface might have been applied with greater vigour to the notes in the earlier part of the book, which are still sadly redundant, and occasionally (see, for instance, the note to 32 & 33 Vict. c. 55, s. 1) so choke the section annotated as to spread it over eight pages, and render it no easy matter to read. Similarly, the statutes might have been more abridged. The "Parliamentary" clauses of the Act of 1878 are, perhaps, properly printed, but a very slight extract from the Promissory Oaths Act, 1868, would have sufficed. The index is a remarkably good one, and the book, though rather clumsy in shape, is very well printed.

On Tuesday evening the members of the Midland and North-Eastern Circuits entertained Mr. Justice Cave at dinner in the Inner Temple-hall, in order to celebrate the learned judge's recent elevation to the bench. The chair was occupied by Mr. Alfred Wills, Q.C., and there was a large attendance of leaders and juniors of the circuits.

The following are the circuits chosen by the judges for the ensuing Spring Assizes:—Midland Circuit, Mr. Justice Lopes; Western Circuit, Mr. Justice Manisty; South-Eastern Circuit, Mr. Justice Hawkins; North-Eastern Circuit, Mr. Justice Stephen; Northern Circuit, Mr. Justice Watkin Williams and Mr. Justice Mathew; and North and South Wales Circuits, Mr. Justice Cave.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

THE INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY AND  
THE "LAW LIST."

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—Will you be so good as to insert in your columns the enclosed letter, which I have, by direction of the Council of the Incorporated Law Society, sent to Mr. John Nicholls in answer to his letter which appeared in your issue of the 26th inst., with reference to the omission from the *Law List* of the asterisk formerly affixed to the name of every solicitor who was a member of this society.

March 30.

E. W. WILLIAMSON, Secretary.

[The following is the letter referred to:—

(Copy.)

Incorporated Law Society, Chancery-lane,  
March 30, 1881.

Dear Sir,—I am directed by the council to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 23rd inst.

The council desire me to state that, as far as the public is concerned, it has already by means of the issue of the *Law List*, a list of practising solicitors to refer to, but the official authority given to that work does not extend to any mark that may be affixed to the name of a solicitor who happens to be a member of this society.

In the instance given in your letter of an inaccuracy in the local list, you do not furnish me with such information as will enable me to discover how it arose, if it exists.

If, however, I am correct in assuming that it refers to the case of a member who practises at Merthyr Tydfil, I may mention that the information given by that gentleman is now before me, in which no reference is made to an address at Aberdare. After the proof was struck off a slip was sent to him, and returned marked "perfectly correct." The local list was framed from particulars supplied by the members themselves, after a special application made to each of them.

That there may be an error here and there is not improbable on the first publication of a work of this character; but, subject to this, it may be fairly stated that an accurate list of the members of this society is given in the calendar.

The fact of previous *Law Lists* having contained very numerous inaccuracies has been so far established as to enable the council to state that the previous system did not work satisfactorily.

In 1880 the complaints were very numerous as to the errors and omissions in the issue of that year.—I am, dear Sir, yours faithfully,

E. W. WILLIAMSON, Secretary.

J. Nicholls, Esq., 73, Gresham-street, E.C.]

## THE SOLICITORS' BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—The balance-sheet of this society for the half-year ending the 31st of August, 1880, has lately been distributed. I find the receipts from subscriptions and donations amount to £1,519 18s. 10d., and that the expenses (including those of the annual dinner) amount to £523 7s. 4d., or more than a third of the first-mentioned sum. A subscriber of twenty-one shillings must, therefore, see that seven shillings of his subscription is spent in distributing the remainder of it. It is true that I have taken no account of the income from invested funds, but the receipt and distribution of this income can scarcely be said to be a material item of expense. I draw attention to these figures, not with a view of injuring the object of the association, but rather to point out that the amalgamation of this society with another

having kindred objects would probably reduce the expenses to a sum less disproportionate to the income.

March 29.

A SOLICITOR.

[It is right to point out that our correspondent appears to have looked only at the half-yearly balance sheet for the latter part of the year, which includes the annual dinner and the heavy cost of printing the rules and report, and sending a copy to every member of the profession. If he will refer to the balance-sheet for the previous half-year—i.e., to February 28, 1880, he will find that the expenses are only £204 19s. 6d.—Ed. S.J.]

## CASES OF THE WEEK.

CONTEMPT OF COURT—MOTION TO COMMIT PUBLISHER OF NEWSPAPER—ADVERTISEMENT—REWARD OFFERED FOR EVIDENCE—COSTS.—In a case of *The Plating Company v. Farguharson*, before the Court of Appeal on the 23rd ult., an application was made for the committal of the publishers of a newspaper for an alleged contempt of court in inserting in the newspaper an advertisement tending to prejudice the plaintiffs in the prosecution of the action, and of an appeal which had been brought by the defendants from the judgment of Bacon, V.C., at the trial. The action was brought to restrain the infringement by the defendants of the plaintiffs' patent. The defendants denied the validity of the patent, and in particular they disputed the novelty of the invention. At the trial of the action Bacon, V.C., overruled the objections, and granted the plaintiffs an injunction. The defendants gave notice of appeal, and, after the notice had been given, an advertisement appeared in the newspaper in question offering a reward of £100 to anyone who could produce documentary evidence that the process to which the patent related had been performed before the year 1869. The plaintiffs alleged that the publication of this advertisement was a contempt of court, and applied to the Court of Appeal for an order to commit the publishers. It was urged that the advertisement would tend to induce the forging of documents, and reliance was placed on the case of *Pool v. Sacheverel* (1 P. W. 675), in which Lord Chancellor Maclesfield committed for contempt a person who had inserted in a newspaper an advertisement offering a reward to any person who should discover and legally prove that a marriage, the validity of which was in question in the suit, was invalid. The Lord Chancellor was of opinion that the advertisement was a direct inducement to subornation of perjury. The court (JESSEL, M.R., and JAMES and COTTON, L.JJ.) refused the application. JESSEL, M.R., said that the advertisement had been inserted by the publishers in the ordinary course of business, and it was clear that they had no intention of interfering with the administration of justice. In order to justify an order for committal, it must be shown that the advertisement, on the face of it, would convey to the mind of a person of ordinary intelligence that it would tend to interfere with the administration of justice. In his lordship's opinion the advertisement was a very harmless one; £100 was not a very large sum, and documentary evidence was not easily forged. The notion that the advertisement would induce the forgery of documents was a wild one, and was not founded on any reasonable construction of it. It was a common practice to offer rewards for the discovery of a lost deed or a lost marriage certificate, and his lordship had never heard it suggested that this was illegal. He did not profess to understand the case of *Pool v. Sacheverel*, as it was reported. Of course, an attempt to suborn witnesses would be contempt of court, but on the facts, as they appeared in the report, his lordship should not have come to the same conclusion as Lord Maclesfield did. But that case had no application to the present case, for an advertisement for evidence of something which was not in the knowledge of the advertiser, but which he believed to be true, could not be treated as a subornation of perjury. But his lordship said that, if necessary, he should feel at liberty to disregard *Pool v. Sacheverel*. He added that the practice of making motions of this kind against editors or publishers of newspapers ought to be discouraged; they caused great loss of time and great expense. JAMES, L.J., said that *Pool v. Sacheverel* appeared to him to be inconsistent with the practice of the Government to

offer rewards for the conviction of offenders. In opening the motion, the plaintiffs' counsel stated that the plaintiffs did not wish to ask for a committal, the only object being to stop the publication of the advertisement, and to obtain an apology. COTTON, L.J., said that he entirely disapproved of the making of motions to commit, when there was no intention of asking for a committal, but the only object was to obtain costs and an apology. In such cases he thought no costs of the motion ought to be given. JESSEL, M.R., and JAMES, L.J., expressed their concurrence in this.—SOLICITORS, *W. Foster*; *S. Whitehead*.

**BANKRUPTCY—APPROPRIATION TO CREDITORS OF "SALARY OR INCOME" OF BANKRUPT—VOLUNTARY ALLOWANCE—BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1869, s. 90.**—In a case of *Ex parte Wicks*, before the Court of Appeal on the 24th ult., the question arose whether, when a bankrupt is in the receipt of a purely voluntary allowance, the court can, under section 90 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, order it or any part of it to be appropriated for the benefit of the creditors. Section 88 enables the trustee of a bankrupt benefited clergyman to obtain a sequestration of the profits of the benefice. And section 89 provides for the receipt by the trustee of a bankrupt who is or has been an officer of the army or navy, or a civil servant of the Crown, of so much of the bankrupt's pay, half-pay, salary, emolument, or pension as the court thinks just or reasonable, for the purpose of distribution amongst the creditors. And section 90 provides that, "where a bankrupt is in the receipt of a salary or income other than as aforesaid, the court, upon the application of the trustee, shall from time to time make such order as it thinks just for the payment of such salary or income, or of any part thereof, to the trustee during the bankruptcy, and to the registrar, if necessary, at the close of the bankruptcy, to be applied by him in such manner as the court may direct." In *Ex parte Wicks* the debtor was at the commencement of his liquidation in receipt of a purely voluntary allowance of £200 a-year, but had no claim, legal or equitable, for it upon the person from whom he received it. The trustee applied to the county court for an order attaching the allowance, but the judge held that section 90 did not apply. Bacon, C.J., held (29 W. R. 400), that the allowance, so long as it was paid, was an income of which the debtor was in the receipt within the meaning of section 90, and he ordered the debtor to pay to the trustee one-fourth part of what he should receive from the donor. The Court of Appeal (JAMES, BRETT, and COTTON, L.JJ.), reversed this decision, and restored the order of the county court judge. JAMES, L.J., said that the section did not apply to a purely voluntary allowance; it could only apply when the bankrupt was in the receipt of something to which he had a legal or equitable right. COTTON, L.J., said that section 90 followed other sections which applied to salary or income received by a bankrupt in respect of services rendered by him in various ways, salary or income to which he had a claim. Section 90 applied to something of a similar character which was not within the previous sections, and it meant an income of which the bankrupt was in the receipt, not by the bounty of another person, but which he had a right to receive. A merely voluntary payment made to the bankrupt for his maintenance after the bankruptcy would clearly not be within section 90, and in his lordship's opinion it made no difference that the voluntary payment was made before the bankruptcy and was continued afterwards.—SOLICITORS, *Wills & Watts*; *T. D. Dutton*.

**BANKRUPTCY—RESOLUTION OF CREDITORS TO ACCEPT COMPOSITION UNDER SECTION 28 OF THE BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1869—LOCUS STANDI OF BANKRUPT TO APPLY TO REDUCE A CREDITOR'S PROOF.**—In a case of *Ex parte Bacon*, before the Court of Appeal on the 24th ult., the question arose whether, after the creditors of a bankrupt have resolved, under section 28 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, to accept a composition, the bankrupt has a *locus standi* to apply to the court to reduce the amount of the proof of a creditor, the proof having been for a long time without objection on the file of the proceedings in the bankruptcy, though not formally admitted by the trustee. Bacon, C.J., held (29 W. R. 299) that the bankrupt was entitled to have the proof investigated, and this decision was upheld by the Court of Appeal (JAMES, BRETT, and COTTON, L.JJ.). It

was argued on behalf of the creditor that the amount of the composition which the creditors had agreed to accept was based upon the amounts of the proofs as they existed on the file of proceedings, and that the bankrupt could not afterwards be allowed to have a proof reduced for his own benefit. And, moreover, it was said that the trustee was the only person entitled to object to the proofs of the creditors, and that he ought to have done so within a reasonable time. JAMES, L.J., said that in an ordinary case of bankruptcy questions as to the amounts of the creditor's proofs ought to be left to the trustee. But there was a broad distinction between the present case and an ordinary bankruptcy, in that an arrangement had been made that the bankrupt should pay a composition, and he was interested in reducing the amounts of the proofs on which he would have to pay. If he did not perform his agreement the court had power to enforce it against him, and, therefore, he had a great interest in seeing how much ought to go to a particular creditor. The trustee in a bankruptcy represented all the creditors. It would be a violation of justice to say that the bankrupt had no interest in a question which arose only between him and the particular creditor, and in which the other creditors had no interest. The question whether the composition had been accepted on the footing of the proofs as they stood was one of merits, not of *locus standi*, and it might possibly be shown that the amount of this particular proof had always been in dispute. The present question was whether the bankrupt was entitled to have the matter investigated, and his lordship thought that he was. He was of opinion also that there was no estoppel by the file of proceedings in the bankruptcy. BRETT, L.J., said that the file of proceedings was not in the nature of a record, and that the bankrupt was entitled to go behind it. COTTON, L.J., said that under the special circumstances, the question not being as to an estate vested in a trustee in a bankruptcy, but as to the amount which the bankrupt was to provide to pay the composition, he had, notwithstanding that he was a bankrupt, a right to have the amounts of the proofs ascertained.—SOLICITORS, *Western & Son*; *Morley & Shirreff*.

**MARRIED WOMAN—SEPARATE ESTATE—GENERAL ENGAGEMENTS—AFTER-ACQUIRED PROPERTY—RESTRAINT ON ANTICIPATION.**—On the 28th ult., the Court of Appeal (JAMES, BRETT, and COTTON, L.JJ.), reversed the decision of Malins, V.C., in *Pike v. Fitzgibbon* (28 W. R. 667, L. R. 14 Ch. D. 837). The question was whether, when a general engagement has been entered into with a married woman who has separate estate, on the credit of that estate, the creditor with whom the engagement was entered into is entitled to have it enforced against whatever separate estate the married woman has at the time when the judgment is recovered, or only against that separate estate which she had at the time when the engagement was contracted, or so much of it as remains unalienated at the date of the judgment. Malins, V.C., held that the judgment must extend to separate estate acquired after the engagement was contracted, and that even a life estate as to which the married woman was restrained from anticipation, but as to which that restraint had become inoperative by the death of the husband before the date of the judgment, must be included. JAMES, L.J., said that as to the property upon which there had been a restraint on anticipation the result of the Vice-Chancellor's judgment was, in plain English, that a person who was restrained from anticipation could anticipate. Whether it was done by a deed or by contracting a debt, or in any other way, the result would be that the married woman would be contracting a debt in anticipation of her future income. The contention was that a married woman who had separate estate had acquired a sort of equitable status or capacity to contract debts, not only in respect of that estate, but in respect of any separate estate, and indeed, if the argument were pushed to its logical conclusion, any estate which she might acquire; that, in fact, she was relieved altogether from the incapacity of coverture, and was entitled to contract debts to be paid out of any estate which she might subsequently acquire. His lordship was of opinion that there was no authority for that proposition. It was founded on a misapprehension of *Picard v. Hine* (18 W. R. 178, L. R. 5 Ch. 274). The point did not arise there. The inquiry directed in that case was of what the separate property consisted at the date of the judgment, but the object of that inquiry was to prevent any interference with



alienations which the married woman might have made—to ascertain what there remained of that separate estate which she had at the time when she entered into the engagement with the plaintiff. The misapprehension had arisen from not attending to the facts of that case. His lordship desired it to be understood, as the judgment of the Court of Appeal, that in any future case of the kind the proper inquiry would be what separate estate chargeable in equity the married woman had at the date of making the engagement, and what remained of it at the date of the judgment, and that alone was bound by the engagement. That was really the effect of the decision in *Johnson v. Gallagher* (9 W. R. 506, 3 De G. F. & J. 494). BRETT, L.J., said that he understood the effect of the authorities to be, not that equity had created a *status* of a married woman to make contracts, but that it had recognized or created what was called separate estate, and had attached certain liabilities, not to the married woman, but to the separate estate. Courts of equity had held that certain promises made, and not done, by a married woman during coverture, in consequence of the fact that she was possessed of separate estate being known to the person who was dealing with her, would be enforced against the separate estate of which she was possessed at the time when the dealing took place, or so much of it as remained at the time when the judgment was recovered, whether at the time of the judgment the separate estate had or had not ceased to exist as such by reason of the determination of the coverture. But that did not apply to separate estate which came into existence at the date of the engagement. The court was really asked to make new law, but the days were at an end in which any court in this country ought to make new law by judicial decision. And the effect of holding that separate property as to which there was a restraint from anticipation would be affected would be to strike out that restraint. COTTON, L.J., said that a disposition by way of anticipation, which was not to take effect till after the death of the husband, would be as much an anticipation as a disposition which was to take effect a year after it was made, and it would be a *reductio in absurdum* if the same thing could be done by contracting a debt in respect of which the creditor could obtain execution after the death of the husband. The argument was that a married woman who had separate property was treated by a court of equity as if she was a *feme sole*. But that was not so. A man could not be restrained from anticipating his income—a married woman could. She was only treated as a *feme sole* in respect of property with which she was entitled to deal as a *feme sole*, and she was not entitled so to deal with property as to which she was restrained from anticipation, though, as between herself and her husband, she has a *feme sole* in respect of that property too. The nature of the doctrine was explained in the judgment of Lord Justice Turner in *Johnson v. Gallagher* (3 De G. F. & J. 509). If separate property acquired after the date of the engagement was to be held liable to satisfy it, his lordship did not see how any property to which the married woman was entitled when covert, and which was held in trust for her, could be excluded. It was said that an equitable execution ought to apply to everything which a court of equity could reach at the time of the judgment. But the answer was that the only property which a court of equity allowed a married woman to affect by her engagement was property which she had to her separate use at the time of the engagement, and which she was not restrained from anticipating. As to any other property, there was no contract.—SOLICITORS, *Duffield & Bruty*; *Beaumont & Warren*; *Bray & Warren*.

**APPEAL—LOCUS STANDI—"PERSON AGGRIEVED"**—ORDER FOR PROSECUTION FOR OFFENCES UNDER DEBTORS ACT, 1869.—DEBTORS ACT, 1869, ss. 11, 16.—BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1869, s. 71.—In a case of *Ex parte Evans*, before the Court of Appeal on the 24th ult., the question was raised whether a person against whom a prosecution has been directed by the Court of Bankruptcy, as an accomplice of a bankrupt in the commission of offences under the Debtors Act, 1869, is entitled to appeal from the order, or to apply to the court to have it rescinded after he has been acquitted of the alleged offence. On the representation of a creditor the judge of a county court directed the creditor to prosecute the bankrupt, the trustee in the bankruptcy, a solicitor, and another person, for alleged offences under the Debtors Act. The magistrates by whom the charge was heard in the first

instance, dismissed it as against the trustee and the solicitor. The solicitor then applied to the court to expunge from the file of proceedings so much of the order directing the prosecution as related to himself, alleging that he was a "person aggrieved" by the order within the meaning of section 71 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869. The judge of the county court refused the application, and his decision was affirmed by Bacon, C.J. (29 W. R. 200), whose decision was again affirmed by the Court of Appeal (JAMES, BRETT, and COTTON, L.J.). It was urged that the case was distinguishable from *Ex parte Brown* (24 W. R. 750, L. R. 2 Ch. D. 799), in which the Court of Appeal held that a person, against whom a prosecution had been directed by the Court of Bankruptcy as an accomplice of a fraudulent debtor, could not appeal from the order, because, in the present case, the order was *ex facie* without jurisdiction, inasmuch as it directed a creditor to prosecute, whereas section 16 of the Debtors Act, 1869, enacts that the court shall order the trustee to prosecute. JAMES, L.J., said that it was settled by *Ex parte Brown* that a person who was ordered to be prosecuted in this way was not a "person aggrieved" by the order. He might be aggrieved like anyone else by being prosecuted, but the only object of the order of the Court of Bankruptcy was to obtain the payment of the costs of the prosecution by the country. BRETT, L.J., thought *Ex parte Brown* was conclusive, and that that decision was perfectly right. COTTON, L.J., said it would be most unfortunate for persons against whom such a prosecution was directed if they could appeal from the order. If they could appeal at all, they could appeal on the ground that a *prima facie* case was not shown against them, and, if they did not appeal, when the trial took place, it would be said that they had admitted that there was a *prima facie* case against them. His lordship was of opinion that such a person could neither appeal from the order, nor apply after he had been acquitted to have the order rescinded.—SOLICITORS, *John Evans*; *Harper, Broad, & Battecock*.

**PRACTICE—COSTS—PARTY AND PARTY COSTS—TAXATION BY THIRD PARTY—UNDERTAKING TO PAY—SOLICITORS ACT, 1848 (6 & 7 VICT. c. 73), s. 38.**—In a case of *Re Grundy, Kershaw, & Co.*, before the Master of the Rolls on the 25th ult., a motion was made to discharge an order of course for taxation, obtained under section 38 of the Solicitors Act, 1843, under the following circumstances:—A petition was presented for the winding up of a limited company, and before the petition came on to be heard, Messrs. Hulton & Lister, the solicitors of the company, wrote a letter to Messrs. Grundy, Kershaw, & Co., the solicitors of the petitioner, by which, in consideration of their withdrawing the petition, they undertook to pay "all proper costs and charges incident to, and recoverable under, such petition, such costs, in case of difference, to be taxed." The petition was withdrawn, and Messrs. Grundy, Kershaw, & Co. sent to Messrs. Hulton & Lister an account of their costs. These costs could not be agreed between the parties, and Messrs. Grundy & Co. were served with an order made on the petition of the company, referring it to the taxing master to tax and settle the bill, and that in case a sixth should be taxed off, Messrs. Grundy & Co. should pay the costs of taxation. Messrs. Grundy & Co. moved to discharge the order of course, on the ground that it was irregular and inapplicable to a taxation as between party and party, on which footing it ought to be taken, and that they ought not, in any event, to be rendered liable to pay the costs of taxation. For the company on the motion, it was contended that the case was within the words of the 38th section, and that the company were in the position of third parties *quid* the taxation, and that the order of course had been properly made under the section. Reliance was placed upon the case of *Re Hartley* (30 Beav. 620), as showing that the company were in such position, and that the costs—which were there party and party costs—were properly taxable under the section. JESSEL, M.R., said that the letter written by the solicitors was clearly a personal undertaking on their part to pay the taxed costs of the petition. There was an excellent reason why such an undertaking should be given, as otherwise the petition would not have been withdrawn. If Messrs. Hulton & Lister had wanted to tax the petitioner's costs, their course was simple—namely, to take out a summons under the agreement; but the third-party section was only applicable to solicitor and client costs, and the mode of procedure under that section was entirely different to a party and party taxation, as in such case the

person requiring the taxation would have to bear the costs of taxation. There was, no doubt, a hardship that, however large a bill was on a party and party taxation, there was no means of making the solicitor pay the costs of taxation; but there was this to be said, that if a solicitor brought in an exorbitant bill the taxing master could report specially the circumstances, and the court would certainly be able to punish, in some way, such a proceeding. There was also the objection to the order, that it was not obtained by Messrs. Hulton & Lister on the usual terms of being ordered to pay the amount found due. In his opinion the petition was wrong and the order was wrong, and must be discharged with costs, to be paid by the company. In reference to the case of *Re Hartley*, which had been relied upon, he was bound to say the order was right, but the report might well deceive anyone into thinking that the order had been made in reference to party and party costs. According to his view of the report, and it also appeared inferentially from the argument and the judgment, which treated *Vincent v. Venner* (1 M. & K. 212), as a conclusive authority, which decision related to solicitor and client costs, the order to tax really related to solicitor and client costs, and that, of course, made the decision perfectly intelligible. As Messrs. Hulton & Lister desired him to make the proper order, he should now, on their application, make an order to tax Messrs. Grundy's bill as between party and party.—SOLICITORS, *Pritchard, Englefield, & Co.*, for Grundy, *Kershaw, & Co.*, Manchester; *Milne, Riddle, & Mellor*, for Hulton & Lister, Manchester.

## SOLICITORS' CASES.

## COURT OF APPEAL.

(Sittings at Westminster, before BRAMWELL, BAGGALLAY, and LUSH, L.JJ.)

March 25.—*In re James Edward Shearman, A Solicitor.*

This was an appeal by one W. Edwards from an order of a divisional court, dated July 8, 1880, refusing to strike Mr. Shearman, who is a solicitor, off the rolls.

*Edward Pollock*, for the solicitor, called their lordships' attention to an old case (3 N. & M. 566), from which it appeared that the court would not listen to an application to strike a solicitor off the rolls unless it were made by a barrister. The plaintiff was represented by counsel in the Divisional Court, where his application was dismissed with costs, but in this court he was not represented by counsel. This was one of those cases the subject-matter of which was interlocutory, and the appellant, therefore, was out of time.

The appellant, who appeared in person, attempted to show that the cause of his being out of time was the fault of his solicitor.

BRAMWELL, L.J., however, refused to hear him, on the ground that he was too late, and that the cause of his being too late was immaterial.

BAGGALLAY, L.J., concurred.

LUSH, L.J., expressed his concurrence with the principle of the case cited.

The appellant subsequently endeavoured to renew his application, but their lordships refused to listen to him.—*Times.*

In the House of Commons, on the 24th ult., in reply to Mr. Mellor, the Attorney-General stated that there would be no practical difficulty in the way of placing lists for the courts in *Banc* as well as those of appeal and *Nisi Prius* on the notice board of Westminster-hall, and also on a notice-board at the Royal Courts of Justice after the close of each day's sitting, and that arrangement should be carried into effect.

In a case of *Willis v. Willis*, before the Divorce Court, on the 24th ult., a petition for restitution of conjugal rights, the President said:—"It is not any part of the duty of a judge to comment on the law, but I cannot forbear from saying that the law in this matter calls for consideration. I am not aware of any other country in which a judge can force an unwilling wife to return to her husband. I never exercise this jurisdiction without the greatest pain, and, notwithstanding the statement of this gentleman, I have never known a case in which it was not a question of terms."

## THE SOLICITORS' REMUNERATION BILL.

THE following report on this Bill has been issued by the Incorporated Law Society of Liverpool:—The Incorporated Law Society of Liverpool, in common with many other legal societies, has for some years past considered the mode of remuneration in respect of conveyancing business very unsatisfactory, and has advocated the adoption of a scale for such remuneration. The present Bill is framed with a view to meeting the difficulties arising under the system now in vogue, but in some respects it requires amendment and additions. The Bill does not contain a scale of remuneration, but gives power to the Lord Chancellor, the Lord Chief Justice of England, the Master of the Rolls and the President for the time being of the Incorporated Law Society of the United Kingdom, or any three of them, the Lord Chancellor being one, to regulate by general orders the remuneration of solicitors in conveyancing and other non-contentious business. Before any general order can be made it must be submitted to the Council of the Incorporated Law Society, and their observations and suggestions are to be taken into consideration in making the order. The mode of remuneration may be by scale of commission or percentage, or by a gross sum, or by a fixed sum for each document prepared or perused, without regard to length, and may be regulated with reference to the following considerations:—

(1) The position of the client—i.e., whether as vendor or purchaser, mortgagor or mortgagee, and the like. (2) The place and circumstances at or in which the business is transacted and the absence of the solicitor from his usual place of business. (3) The amount of money to which the business relates. (4) The labour and responsibility on the part of the solicitor. (5) The number and importance of the documents prepared or perused. (6) The remuneration in like business at the passing of the Act. The general orders may authorize the taking of security for future costs and the allowance of interest on disbursements. Further, they are to be laid before Parliament, and are not to take effect if an address by either House be presented to the Queen seeking a disallowance of them within one month thereafter. The Bill also proposes to give a power to solicitors to make agreements with clients as to their remuneration for their work, which agreements must be in writing, and may or may not include disbursements in the amount of remuneration stipulated for. These agreements may be sued upon and set aside in the same manner as agreements not relating to the remuneration of solicitors. If, on taxation of costs, any such agreement is objected to by the client, the taxing master may inquire into the facts and certify to the court, who shall have power to order either a cancellation of the agreement or a reduction of the amount payable thereunder. It will be seen that in some respects the Bill is more favourable to solicitors than the Bill of last year. The introduction of the President of the Incorporated Law Society as one of the persons authorized to make general orders, and the provision that the proposed general orders shall be first submitted to the Council of the Incorporated Law Society, and their suggestions considered before such order is made, are concessions to the solicitors. The obnoxious provision that solicitors and their clients should not have power to make any agreement for a larger remuneration than that fixed by the general orders was omitted from the Bill re-introduced in the second session of 1880, and has not been again inserted. That Bill was, however, in one particular more favourable to the profession than the present one, inasmuch as, while it provided that an agreement for the remuneration of a solicitor might be set aside on the like grounds as any other agreement, it further stipulated that the remuneration under such contract should not be subject to any taxation, examination, or allowance. The committee are, however, of opinion that no objection should be taken to this part of the Bill, as only the less scrupulous practitioners would be likely to induce their clients to enter into arrangements which would be liable to be impeached, and the section would not, therefore, be likely to affect the majority of the profession. On the whole, therefore, the committee approve of the measure, but recommend that the following points should not be lost sight of. They see no reason to change their opinion expressed in their report on this subject of last year, that a scale of fees which includes disbursements cannot be applied satisfactorily. It is obvious that at the commencement of any

conveyancing business the solicitor is usually in the dark as to the amount of the necessary disbursements. An application to the Chancery Division may be requisite, or questions of pedigree may arise, involving heavy payments; or title-deeds may be wrongly stamped, involving payment of further duties and penalties. The committee consider that the principle of charging by scale is inapplicable to settlements, many of the most complicated of which relate to landed property, which it would be inconvenient to value for the purpose of ascertaining a percentage remuneration. Others, too, involving in their preparation considerable care and labour, are mainly concerned with property to be subsequently brought into settlement, and the inability to assess a remuneration by scale applies to them in a still greater degree. It is submitted that in the case of settlements the remuneration must almost necessarily be fixed by a consideration both of the labour involved and the length of the document. The committee are also of opinion that interest ought to be allowed upon the solicitor's profit charges as well as upon his disbursements, commencing after a reasonable time. It is notorious that solicitors have to wait for long periods of time from causes beyond their control for payment of their costs, and it is difficult to see why compensation, in the form of interest, should not be given to them for the loss they thus sustain. The most important objection to the Bill, however, is that the scale to be adopted is not set out in it. The committee think that it is essential that the general body of solicitors should know what fees will in future be allowed to them, and have the opportunity of being heard on the matter before the Bill becomes law. The committee recommend that a petition be presented to the House of Commons praying that the Bill do not pass into law in its present form on the following grounds:—

1. No scale which includes disbursements will be satisfactory or just, either to the profession or the public, as it must be impossible to estimate the disbursements at the outset of the business.

2. The principle of charging by scale cannot fairly or properly be applied to cases other than sales, conveyances, mortgages, and leases.

3. Any scale which may be adopted should be set out in the Act.

4. Provision should be made for allowance of interest to solicitors on all their charges, and not on disbursements only, in proper cases.

The committee will, probably, consider it necessary to put amendments on the notice paper of the House of Commons embodying the above recommendations in case the Bill should be read a second time. To prevent this occurrence the committee suggest that members of Parliament be requested to vote against the Bill in its present form, and that to this end the aid of the other law societies of the kingdom be invited.

March 19, 1881.

The society has presented the following petition to the House of Commons:—

To the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

The humble Petition of the Incorporated Law Society of Liverpool under the common seal.

Sheweth that a bill, shortly called the Solicitors' Remuneration Bill, is now proceeding in your Honourable House providing for the remuneration of solicitors in conveyancing matters by a scale of commission and percentage without regard to the length of the document prepared, and having reference to the following considerations:—(1) The position of the client—*i.e.*, whether as vendor or purchaser, mortgagor or mortgagee, and the like. (2) The place and circumstances at or in which the business is transacted, and the absence of the solicitor from his usual place of business. (3) The amount of money to which the business relates. (4) The labour and responsibility on the part of the solicitor. (5) The number and importance of the documents prepared or perused. (6) The remuneration in like business at the passing of the Act. Your petitioners will view the adoption of the principle of charging by commission or percentage with the greatest satisfaction. Your petitioners, however, respectfully submit to your Honourable House that any scale which may be adopted should be set out in the Act. The Bill is silent as to what remuneration will be sanctioned, and your petitioners consider it essential that the general body of solicitors should

know what fees will in future be allowed to them, and should have the opportunity of being heard on the matter.

For the above and various other reasons of minor importance your petitioners pray that the Bill, in its present form, may not pass into law.

And your petitioners will ever pray, &c.

## SOCIETIES.

### BARRISTERS' BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION.

The eighth annual general meeting of this society was held on Wednesday afternoon in the Middle Temple Hall. The Lord Chancellor presided, and among those present were the Lord Chief Justice, Lord Justice Brett, Mr. Justice Manisty, Mr. Justice Watkin Williams, Mr. Justice Mathew, Mr. Justice Kay, Mr. Baron Pollock, Vice-Chancellor Hall, Sir R. Collier, the Attorney and Solicitor-General, and many members of the bar.

The annual report, which was submitted to the meeting, stated that during the year sixteen new members had joined the association as subscribers or donors. The contributions amounted to £365 15s. 4d. The annual income now amounted to £1,604 11s. 1d., of which, during the past year, £312 13s. 1d. had been derived from interest on investments. Many applications for relief had been made during the year to the committee, and in twenty cases relief had been granted, although many applications had been refused solely on account of want of funds. In several instances the committee felt painfully that the sum voted to applicants was wholly insufficient. Several of the grants it was noted were made to the widows and families of men who had attained a high and honourable position at the bar.

Lord SELBORNE, in moving the adoption of the report, said: I have to apologize for the fact that down to the present time I have not entitled myself to any such honour as presiding at this meeting by contributing to its funds. I hope, however, you will believe that that has not been due to want of sympathy with the work of the association. The fact is, that the society came into existence about the time I left the bar, and during the time I was at the bar I was accustomed to take part from time to time in other methods of providing for similar wants. With respect to the objects of the association, I need not say that until the time this association was formed, the profession of the bar was the only one of the great learned professions which had not large provision made by public institutions or otherwise for the wants of such of its members as might fall into misfortune. If there is any learned profession which has peculiar claims upon its members for this kind of assistance the bar may be said to have as strong as any of them. I was thirty-five years in practice at the bar, and few men had better opportunities of thoroughly knowing and understanding the profession; and I must say, by way of testimony to that profession, that I cannot call to mind the time at which I was not led to think more and more highly of the qualities which generally distinguish its members, not only of honour and integrity, but of kindness, generosity, and mutual regard and respect, even in those circumstances of necessary rivalry and different success in fortune which might, in many minds, provoke a very different kind of feeling. If that is so, then the feelings which such mutual bearing and conduct must engender lead naturally to sympathy with those members of the profession who fall into misfortune. All of us probably must have had only too frequent occasion to observe the effect of those causes which produce unmerited misfortune. In the first place, there are young men full of hope and promise, who come to the bar, and do all that is in their power to distinguish themselves in that walk of life, but who, from year to year, find that the business which they hoped for does not come, and on that account fall into difficulties through no fault of their own. Then there are others who, as time goes on, find other men treading on their heels, and their business growing less and less till at last it leaves them. In the meantime, they may have contracted those relations to which all of us look forward, in the hope that matters would look brighter, but which nevertheless go backward. Then, again, there is another class of men who are generous, possibly even more than prudence would justify, or who may



invest their savings in securities which turn out the reverse of safe or profitable, and so become embarrassed by debt. There are also men with an acknowledged reputation for learning who have seemed to have within their grasp these honours they hoped for, but which have slipped away and left them but ill-rewarded for their talents. I have known such men, who have lived to a great age, and before the close of their lives have not had the means of living except through the kindness and sympathy of their brethren at the bar. We may see, too, men whose bodily or mental health breaks down, or who are cut off, it may be in the prime of life, leaving behind them widows and families, the objects of their dearest affections, who have to struggle on as best they can. Now, there is not one of us to whom such things might not possibly have happened, and no more need be said as to the special call thus made upon the prosperous among the profession. Help ought to be given, not in a careless way, not in a way which may wound the feelings of its recipients, but after careful inquiry, and with much consideration of the feelings of those who receive it. From what I have heard and read, I am satisfied that that is the way in which this association acts. In fact, I think that all the conditions of a thoroughly good association are fulfilled in respect to this society. The need is great; it is commended to the feelings of the bar by sympathies of the strongest kind, and help is given under the management of men entitled to the thorough confidence of the profession, and who prove their interest in the work by the personal attention they give to it. I heartily wish the association success, and that each year may witness a great addition to its funds.

The report was adopted, and other resolutions were also agreed to upon the motion of the Lord Chief Justice, Lord Justice Brett, Mr. Justice Manisty, Mr. Justice Kay, the Attorney-General, the Solicitor-General, and others.

#### LAW UNION FIRE AND LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

The annual general meeting was held on the 24th ult. at the offices, 126, Chancery-lane, James Cuddon, Esq., the chairman of the board, presiding.

Mr. F. MCGEDY (the actuary and secretary) read the notice convening the meeting and the minutes of the previous meeting. The report and accounts were taken as read.

The CHAIRMAN said—Gentlemen, it gives me great pleasure upon meeting you on this occasion to be able to congratulate you on the continued success of our company. It would have been no matter of surprise if the general depression had occasioned some falling off in the average of the new business. The new premiums in the life department for the past year were, as the accounts before you show, £10,383, while the average new premiums per year during the past quinquennium were £8,864. Thus, the commencement of the current quinquennium as to new life business shows a very handsome increase. There were during the past year fifty-nine claims, averaging, including bonuses, £691. The average amount per policy in force having been £839, the difference in our favour, in the expectation as to amount, has been no inconsiderable advantage. The average amount of the new life policies issued during the past year was £980, showing an excess of £141 over the average of policies in force at the end of the last quinquennium. This is a movement in the right direction. During the past year ninety-five policies have lapsed, the total amount insured whereby was £68,608, with yearly premiums thereon of £1,145. The surrenders were sixty-six in number. The total amount insured by the policies so surrendered was £69,852, with yearly premiums thereon of £1,873. The total amount of new life business proposed during the past year was very large, as you will observe. It was about £98,000 in excess of the amount actually completed. It is to be regretted that there was a necessity for declining many proposals, and that others went off from causes beyond our control. I may, however, state that in all the cases of declined policies—forty-three in number—the board simply exercised that caution which the circumstances appeared to demand—a caution which I doubt not you will appreciate. With regard to the fire department, the amount of the new yearly premiums, namely, £8,242, shows a substantial increase upon the average of the new yearly premiums during the past quinquennium, such average having been £7,738. Although the fire losses were somewhat in excess of those of the previous year, it must be remembered that the

losses in such previous year were exceptionally small, and that losses must be looked at with reference to the increasing amount insured year by year. Certainly our good fortune as to losses from fire has for several years been remarkable, the claims having been much less than the computation. We have thus been enabled this year to increase the fire reserve fund to the extent of £6,000, raising that fund up to the amount of one year's net premium income. According to the opinions even of extremely cautious persons a fire reserve fund equal to one year's total premium income is amply sufficient, but this applies more especially to a business such as ours, which is a home business and that generally of a first-class nature. A considerable proportion of that reserve fund is set down in our books to an account called current risks, which now stands at very nearly £22,000; the remaining part of that fund, amounting to about £14,000, is made up of the one-fifth of declared profits yearly set aside under the terms of the deed of settlement, and which is, as you are aware, in part divisible periodically as thereby provided. Now, as to the dividend proposed to be declared. It may be well to advert to the line of policy we have always—as I think, prudently and judiciously—pursued, of keeping in hand on the profit and loss account a sufficient sum to guard against the occurrence of one or two less prosperous years, so as to enable us without regard to the diminished profit in any such year to maintain the dividend. After taking out of the fund to the profit and loss account what is required for the dividend now proposed to be paid, the large sum of £21,000 remains—it is probably more than is sufficient for the purpose I have mentioned, but this is indeed, to my mind, a comfortable and satisfactory position. So long as we can command the continuance of a new premium income in both departments combined of £18,000, or anything near it, we shall have every reason to be particularly well satisfied—£18,000 a year new premium income seems large, but we must not lose sight of lapses and surrenders, and other circumstances by which old premium income is necessarily diminished. Indeed, all that we require to realize the great expectations which many of us have—I think with good reason—formed as to the future of the company is your earnest and combined support. In the name of the directors I beg to express our appreciation of the honour you have done us in giving us your confidence and aiding us by your influence, and to assure you that no exertions on our parts shall be wanting steadily to increase the magnitude and prosperity of the company. It really would be a much less arduous task to double the present income of £150,000 a year than it has been to create that income.

The CHAIRMAN moved the adoption of the report and accounts.

Mr. C. PEMBERTON (deputy-chairman).—I have great pleasure in seconding that resolution, and all I can say is that I hope with the chairman you will favour us with your influence in sending new business to the office. If you will only do that you need have no fear as the continued prosperity of the office.

The resolution was at once cordially adopted.

Mr. JOHN ROOT.—I have much pleasure in moving the following resolution: "That the recommendation of the directors in their report now read as to the payment of dividend be adopted, and that a dividend of 3s. per share, free of income tax, be paid to the shareholders on the paid-up capital for the financial year ending the 30th of November, 1881."

Mr. R. WARD seconded the motion, which was at once agreed to.

Mr. JOSEPH DODDS, M.P., proposed, and Mr. THOMAS G. MILLS seconded, the re-election of the retiring directors, and the names were put severally and separately to the meeting, each being unanimously re-elected.

On the motion of Mr. G. U. ROBINS, seconded by Mr. GEORGE THOMAS, Mr. Theodore Waterhouse, the shareholders' auditor, was re-elected.

The CHAIRMAN proposed the re-election of Mr. James J. Darley, the directors' auditor.

Mr. PEMBERTON seconded the motion, which was at once carried.

Mr. HARCOURT MASTER proposed that the sum of fifty guineas be paid to each of the auditors for his services during the past year.

Mr. W. NEWTON seconded the motion, which was carried unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN.—I beg to propose a vote of thanks to our

able actuary and secretary for his great assiduity and attention to the business of the company. With Mr. McGedy I will also include the staff, who certainly have done their duty admirably. I hope this resolution will be carried by acclamation.

Mr. ERASMUS WILSON, F.R.S.—If I may be permitted to second that resolution, I will say that there are duties and duties; and I feel quite convinced that the duties which devolve upon our secretary and the staff are duties which they perform without hesitation, as a necessity of their nature, and that all their thoughts are directed towards the success of the company with which they are associated. They do not work merely because work is a necessity of life, but because it is the only thing calculated to prolong life, to give appetite and improve digestion, to make themselves happy, and also to confer benefit on the company in which they are interested. Under these circumstances, I am sure that all the shareholders present will throw up both hands in acclamation in supporting this motion.

The resolution having been very cordially adopted,

Mr. F. MCGEDY said—Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, on my own behalf and on behalf of the staff, I return you my sincere thanks for this very cordial vote in recognition of our past conduct. If I may refer to what Mr. Wilson has so kindly said in our favour, I would assure you that our hearts are in the work, and that we do our best at all times to promote the interests of the company.

Mr. PAMBERTON said he had great pleasure in proposing a vote of thanks to their solicitor, Mr. Burges, to whose courtesy and judgment they were greatly indebted. There had never been a single instance since he had been their solicitor in which there had been any dissatisfaction with his conduct, and both personally and professionally they were indebted to him for a great deal of the business which came to the office.

Mr. E. BURKITT seconded the motion, which was at once agreed to.

Mr. BURGES briefly acknowledged the compliment, assuring them that he should do all in his power to promote the interests of the company.

Mr. JOSEPH DODDS, M.P.—There is another duty which we ought to discharge, and that is to pay a due meed of approbation to our excellent chairman. I beg to propose that our most hearty thanks be given to him for his valuable services to the company. We have seen him in this room and elsewhere conducting the business of the company in a manner that leaves nothing whatever to be desired. Entirely as I concur in the votes which have already been passed, and in the eulogiums which have been pronounced upon our various officials, I am sure you will feel that without such an able head in guiding the society the success that has attended us up to the present time, and which seems to increase year by year, would not have been insured to us.

Mr. BASIL FIELD seconded the resolution, which was carried by acclamation.

The CHAIRMAN—I beg to tender you, gentlemen, my most sincere thanks for the very kind way in which you have passed this vote of thanks. I feel that you are far too kind, and that your expressions in appreciation of my services are more eulogistic than they should be. I can only say that I will endeavour, as far as I possibly can, by every means in my power, to promote the success of this company, which I have very much at heart, and nothing gives me greater pleasure than to see it progress year by year.

The meeting then dispersed.

## LEGAL APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. EDWARD EBENEZER KAY, Q.C., has been appointed a Judge of the Chancery Division, in succession to Sir Richard Malins, resigned. Mr. Justice Kay is the son of Mr. Robert Kay, of Rochdale, Lancashire, and was born in 1822. He was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he graduated B.A. in 1844, and he was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Trinity Term, 1847. He published (in conjunction with Mr. Henry Vaughan Johnson) several volumes of reports in the court of Vice-Chancellor Wood. He became a Queen's Counsel in 1866, and he was for several years one of the leaders in the court of Vice-Chancellors Wool, Giffard, James, and Bacon. Mr. Justice Kay is a

bencher of Lincoln's-inn, a member of the Incorporated Council of Law Reporting, a magistrate for Norfolk, and one of the chairmen of quarter sessions for that county.

Mr. WILLIAM JOSEPH BIRD, solicitor, of Liverpool, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature.

Mr. URIAH BOWER BRODRICK, solicitor, of 42, Cornhill, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature.

Mr. MONTGOMERY HOOPER, solicitor, Birmingham, has been appointed by the Lord Chancellor a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature.

Mr. WILLIAM JOHN HUMFYS, solicitor, of Hereford, has been appointed by the high sheriff of Herefordshire (Mr. Edward Howorth Greenly) to be Under-Sheriff of that county for the ensuing year. Mr. Humfys was admitted a solicitor in 1863.

Mr. THEODORE JOHN SMITH, solicitor (of the firm of Smith & Atkinson), of Hastings and Rye, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature.

## COMPANIES.

### WINDING-UP NOTICES.

#### JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

##### LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

ALGERIAN MINERAL COMPANY, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented March 23, directed to be heard before the M.R. on Apr. 2. Milne and Co, Harcourt bldgs, Temple, agents for Baby, Manchester, solicitors for the petitioner.

DARLINGTON IRON COMPANY, LIMITED.—By an order made by the M.R. dated March 19 it was ordered that the voluntary winding up of the company be continued, and the court appointed William Barclay Peat, Ladbury, an additional liquidator, to act jointly with Edwin Waterhouse, the liquidator. Bower and Cotton, Chancery Lane, solicitors for the petitioners.

ECOLESHILL WORSTED MILL COMPANY, LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before Apr. 23, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims to William Gilyard, Bradford. May 6 at 11 is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

EDISON TELEPHONE COMPANY OF LONDON, LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before Apr. 25, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Samuel Lowell Price, Gresham St. May 9 at 11 is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts or claims.

GENERAL FIREWORK COMPANY, LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before Apr. 27 to send their names and addresses and the particulars of their debts or claims to George Augustus Cape, Old Jewry. May 10 at 12 is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

METROPOLITAN AND SUBURBAN STEAM LAUNDRY COMPANY, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented March 21, directed to be heard before the M.R. on Apr. 2. Barker, Bedford Row, solicitor for the petitioners.

NEUFODLAND LAND COMPANY, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented March 21, directed to be heard before the M.R. on Apr. 2. Makinson and Carpenter, Devereux Ct, Temple, solicitors for the petitioner.

NEWPORT CREDIT ASSOCIATION, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up presented March 21, directed to be heard before the M.R. on Apr. 2. Rogers and Chave, Queen Victoria St, solicitors for the petitioners.

STRATFORD FREE LANCE AND WEST HAN REPORTER NEWSPAPER COMPANY, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented March 18, directed to be heard before the M.R. on Apr. 2. Ponce and Waller, Grocer's Hall Ct, Poultry, solicitors for the petitioner.

YARNERDNEY TIN PLATE COMPANY, LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before Apr. 30 to send their names and addresses and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Richard Garnant Cawker, Temple St, Swansea. May 16 at 12 is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims. [Gazette, Mar. 25.]

SANDERSON AND COMPANY, LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before Apr. 30, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims to Thomas George Sharpe, Huddersfield. May 18 at 12 is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the claims.

YARMOUTH AQUARIUM SOCIETY, LIMITED.—The M.R. has by an order, dated March 4, appointed Mr. Lovewell Blake, Great Yarmouth, to be official liquidator. Creditors are required, on or before Apr. 28 to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims to the above. May 10 at 11 is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims. [Gazette, Mar. 25.]

##### UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

MIDDLESBOROUGH, REDCAR, SALTSBURGH-BY-THE-SEA, AND CLEVELAND DISTRICT PERMANENT BENEFIT BUILDING SOCIETY.—Petition for winding up, presented March 26, directed to be heard before the M.R. on Apr. 6. Jackson, Clement's inn, Strand, agent for Jackson and Jackson, Middlesborough, solicitors for the petitioners.

[Gazette, Mar. 25.]

## FRIENDLY SOCIETIES DISSOLVED.

DEEPING BENEFIT ASSURANCE SOCIETY, Market Deeping and Deeping St James, Lincoln. March 23.  
DOWLESTON FRIENDLY SOCIETY, Doleleston, Chester. March 23. [Gazette, Mar. 25.]  
MAONIC BENEFIT SOCIETY, White Hart Tavern, College st, Lambeth. March 24.

[Gazette, Mar. 20.]

## BUSINESS AT WESTMINSTER.

ALTHOUGH, says the *Times* reporter, only two or three weeks have elapsed since, at the end of February, when the Order in Council fusing the common law divisions took effect, the Judicature Act came for the first time fully into operation, the effect of continuous sittings of courts for different kinds of business has already been shown in a very striking way. As to business in *Banc*, the Special Paper was speedily cleared, and the New Trial Paper much reduced; and only two cases remained in the Crown Paper and five from inferior courts. The great bulk of business in *Banc* is (as it has always been) in the Trial Paper, though that is much reduced, as regards business in *Banc*, by the operation of Lord Cairns' Act, under which the judges who try cases dispose of them on further consideration; and, of course, new cases are continually being entered from time to time; but at this time only 69 cases remain in the New Trial Paper and 12 in the Special Paper—six special cases and six demurrers—and two in the Crown Paper and five from inferior courts, making altogether only 88 cases in *Banc* to dispose of, which two courts in *Banc* will be sitting continuously up to Easter to try, and it may safely be said, will dispose of them all. As to *Nisi Prius* business, the following is a correct account:—Total Middlesex printed list, 741. (The figures on the list are 734. The additional seven were cases which were stayed at the time of the publication of the list, and were therefore omitted from it, but afterwards restored to their places on becoming ready for trial):—Tried, special juries, 80; common juries, 207—287; withdrawn or struck out, 256; stayed, 21; in list for March 26, 44 made *remanets* by the parties, 80; *remanets* for want of time to try, special juries, 19; common juries, 74—93; total, 741. Estimated list for Easter Sitting:—The above *remanets*, 173; entered after the publication of the Hilary printed list, and now ready for trial, 344; probable entry to April 27 inclusive, judging by experience—say, 163; total, 680. Then the following is a correct statement of the cases in the London List:—In the present printed list there are—Special juries, 170; common juries, 303—473. Of the special juries, 14 actions by the same plaintiff (on marine policies) are stayed. About 20 other actions are also already stayed. The 473, therefore, should be considerably discounted before the real task which is before the courts can be correctly estimated.

## OBITUARY.

## MR. JOHN BREND WINTERBOTHAM.

Mr. John Brend Winterbotham, solicitor (the head of the firm of Winterbotham, Bell, & Winterbothams), of Cheltenham, died on February 27. Mr. Winterbotham was the son of the Rev. William Winterbotham, and was born in 1806. He was admitted a solicitor in 1827, and had practised for more than half a century at Cheltenham. He was for several years associated in partnership with his elder brother, the late Mr. Rayner Winterbotham, and was afterwards joined by Mr. John Penrice Bell, and still more recently by his sons, Mr. John Brend Winterbotham, jun. (who was admitted in 1854), and Mr. James Battan Winterbotham (who was admitted in 1859). Mr. Winterbotham always acted with the Liberal party, and took an active interest in local business. He was for many years one of the Cheltenham Improvement Commissioners. He was opposed to the incorporation of the borough, but ever since the granting of the charter he had been a member of the Town Council for the South Ward. Two or three years ago he declined a request to serve the office of mayor. Mr. Winterbotham was buried on the 3rd ult., most of the members of the Town Council being present at the funeral.

## CREDITORS' CLAIMS.

## CREDITORS UNDER ESTATES IN CHANCERY. LAST DAY OF PROOF.

AMBROSE, SAMUEL, Haven lane, Haven Green, Gardener. April 5. Ambrose v Ambrose, Fry, J. Wright, Walbrook.  
BOLLETER, HENRY, Charlotte st, Portland pl, Gent. April 25. Hess v Bolleter, Fry, J. Howard, New Bridge st.  
COATES, EDMUND, jun, Lodge rd, St John's Wood, Wine Merchant. April 15. Irving v Barker, M.R. Barker, Bedford row.  
HARGREAVE, CHARLES, Cladrice gds, Bayswater, Gent. April 11. Coupland v Allen, V.C. Hall. Phillips, Old Jewry chambers.  
HARRIS, GEORGE SMITH DELAVAY, Linslade, Bucks, M.D. April 11. Cloutie v Harris, V.C. Bacon. Martin, Fenchurch st.  
MORDEY, JAMES JOSEPH, Colchester, Plumber. April 20. Morden v Martin, V.C. Hall. White, Colchester.  
ROCHE, JAMES, Deal, Gent. April 22. Newman v Roche, V.C. Bacon. Mellor, Harcourt bldgs, Temple.  
RODIE, JOHN JAMES, Plymouth, Gent, and JANE RODIE, Homiducumble pl, Plymouth. April 16. Rodie v Rodie, V.C. Malins. Vizard, Lincoln's inn fields.  
SWIFT, WILLIAM, Ledsham, Chester, Hotel Keeper. April 13. Swift v Swift, V.C. Bacon. Moore, Birkenhead.  
WILSON, JANE, Silems, Malta. May 1. Hensman v Clark, V.C. Hall. Hensman, College hill.

[Gazette, March 18.]

EVANS, WILLIAM, Pennard, Farmer. April 15. Evans v Davies, M.R. Collins, Swansea.  
HILL, HUGH, London rd, Southwark, Horse Repository Keeper. March 23. Pharaoh v Apps, V.C. Bacon. Castle, Poultry.  
INGHAM, JAMES, Stonestile, nr Bradford, Farmer. April 14. Ingham v Ingham, V.C. Bacon. Cross, Bradford.  
LEADBITTER, THOMAS GIBSON, Low Warden, Northumberland, Gent. April 23. Gibson v Gibson, V.C. Hall. Gibson, Hexham.  
PEPPERCORN, WILLIAM, Luton, Yeoman. April 21. Peppercorn v Peppercorn, V.C. Hall. Millman, Great James st, Bedford row.  
SELLEN, JAMES, Sheerness, Licensed Victualler. April 15. Fray v Sellen, M.R. Winch, Chatham.  
WHITE, JOHN, Skipton, York, Builder. April 30. White v White, Fry, J. Robinson, Skipton.

[Gazette, March 22.]

## CREDITORS UNDER 22 &amp; 23 VICT. CAP. 25. LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

ANDERSON, JANE, Sunderland, Shipowner. Apr 11. Steel, Sunderland.  
BAILEY, MARY ANN, Watlington, Kent. Apr 20. Marchant and Co, George yd, Lombard st.  
BAKER, ROBERT BENJAMIN, Shanklin, Isle of Wight, Gent. May 1. Webb, Austinfriars.  
BRADSHAW, JOHN, Bramley, Leeds, retired from business. May 2. Nelson and Co, Leeds.  
BRADY, JOHN, Westbury upon Trym, Gloucester, retired Surgeon. Apr 9. Gregory and Son, Bristol.  
BROWN, HENRY, Halifax, Draper. June 1. Stansfeld, Halifax.  
BROWN, LENNA, Stafford. Apr 30. Greatrex, Stafford.  
CAEWRIGHT, FAIRFAX WILLIAM, New Burlington st, Esq, M.P. Apr 23. Maude, Lincoln's inn fields.  
CLOVE, THOMAS, Nottingham, Esq. Apr 30. Curshaw, Nottingham.  
CULLEY, HENRY, Old Basford, Nottingham, Bleacher. Apr 11. Richards and Woodward, Nottingham.  
DALTON, JANE SARAH, Auburn, Lincoln. Tweed and Co, Lincoln.  
DAVIES, FRANCES, The Pavement, Clapham common. May 1. Greenfield, Abchurch lane.  
DOUST, WILLIAM HENRY, Greenwich, Kent, Pilot. Apr 11. Howard and Shelton, Greenwich rd.  
GRAY, JOSEPH, Wilton, York, Farmer. Apr 6. Whitehead, Pickering.  
GREEN, GEORGE, sen, Mawby rd, Camberwell, Gent. Apr 10. Howard and Shelton, Threadneedle st.  
GRIFFIN, ROBERT, Eastfield rd, Hornsey. Mar 26. Trehearn, Victoria st, Westminster.  
HAGGER, JOHN, Brook st, New rd, Gent. Apr 8. Smith and Wilmer, New sq, Lincoln's inn.  
HOLLIER, RUTH, Peckham, Surrey. Apr 30. Harcourt, Moorgate st.  
KENDALL, THOMAS MITCHELSON, jun, Newton upon Rawcliffe, York Esq. May 1. Peters, York.  
LAMBERT, JOHN, Sunderland, Durham, Shipowner. Apr 11. Steel, Sunderland.  
LOYD, WILLIAM, Llanfomrynall, Denbigh, Clerk in Holy Orders. Apr 21. Lloyd and Roberts, Ruthin.  
LIFE, JOHN, Plymouth. Apr 11. Jode and Co, St Austell.  
MACKIE, WILLIAM, Hindley, Lancaster, Gent. Apr 1. Rowbottom, Wigan.  
MARSHALL, EBERNEZER JOHN, Chichester rents, Chancery lane, Licensed Victualler. Apr 30. Harcourt, Moorgate st.  
MARTIN, ROBERT, St Austell, Cornwall, China Clay Merchant. Apr 9. Code and Co, St Austell.  
METCALFE, WILLIAM, Threshfield, York, Innkeeper. Apr 9. Robinson, Skipton.  
MITCHELL, NANCY, Brighton. Apr 30. Harcourt, Moorgate st.  
MOOREWORTH, THOMAS WILLIAM PONSORBY, Park lane, Tottenham, Esq. Apr 4. Nelson and Co, Essex st, Strand.  
MOLLART, FRANCES, Hanley, Stafford. Apr 10. Wilson, Stoke upon Trent.  
MOON, JAMES STOCKS, Lingfield, Surrey, Esq. Apr 20. Learoyd and Co, Albion chambers, Moorgate.  
MOORE, HENRY, Mardens, Hildenborough, Kent, Esq. May 10. Johnson, Lincoln's inn fields.  
NUTT, MARY ANN, Colchester. March 31. Prior, Colchester.  
OSBORNE, GEORGE WILLOUGHBY, Hawford, Worcester, Major General in Indian Army. Apr 10. Clarke, Gresham House, Old Broad st.



PAUL, MARY, Melcombe Regis. Apr 30. Baskett and Son, Evershot  
 PEECE, SAMUEL, Moffatt, Maidenhead, Berks, Auctioneer. Apr 30. Ward, Maidenhead  
 RANCO, MARY, Teignmouth, Devon. May 9. Griffith, High Holborn  
 ROGEE, JACKSON, Beck, Lamplugh, Cumberland, Retired Farmer. Apr 11. McKelvie, Whitehaven  
 RUSTON, MARY ANN, Whitehaven, Cumberland. Apr 2. Atter, Whitehaven  
 SIMONS, GEORGE, Leicester, Gent. Apr 20. Stevenson and Son, Leicester  
 SMILE, THOMAS LAYD, Tuffnell pk rd, Holloway, Hay Salesman. Apr 15. Martin, London Wall  
 SMALLCOMBE, JOHN, Box, Wilts. Apr 14. Robertson and Maule, Bath  
 SMITH, LUCY, Leicester. May 2. Stevenson and Son, Leicester  
 STOCKDALE, ROBERT, Darlington, Durham, Butcher. Apr 16. Newby and Co, Stockton on Tees  
 SUFFIELD, Right Hon EMILY HARRIOT, Dowager Lady, Weymouth. Apr 18. Taylor, Norwich  
 TORRENTINE, GEORGE, Whitehaven, Cumberland, Builder. Apr 11. McKelvie, Whitehaven  
 VINABLES, ROBERT, Walthamstow, Essex, Esq. Apr 30. Edell, King st, Cheshire  
 WARD, JOHN, Wakefield, no occupation. Apr 16. Jackson, Malton  
 WARWICK, JANE, Scotby, nr Carlisle, Cumberland. Apr 23. Thornburn, Carlisle  
 WILDE, EDWARD, Naimwood, Llandrinio, Montgomery, Farmer. Apr 30. Davies, Oswestry  
 WOOD, ROBERT, Winder, Cumberland, Mining Steward. Apr 11. McKelvie, Whitehaven  
 YOUNG, WILLIAM, Chorlton on Medlock, Lancaster, Shipping Agent. March 31. Myers, Manchester

[Gazette, Mar. 15.]  
 ALDER, THOMAS, Wakefield, York, Esq. July 1. Harrison and Beaumont, Wakefield  
 BRADLEY, SOPHIA, St Leonard's on Sea. Apr 18. Harrison and Co, Lincoln's inn fields  
 BRIDGET, JOHN, Heath, nr Wakefield, Esq. July 1. Harrison and Beaumont, Wakefield  
 BEARS, THOMAS, Beal, Kellington, York, Farmer. Apr 30. Wood, Pontefract  
 BRETT, MARY, St Leonard's on Sea. May 2. Harris and Godwin, Moorgate st  
 BROWN, JOHN NORMAN, Clifton, Bristol, Gent. Apr 30. Beckenham, Bristol  
 CANTER, REV JAMES, Bridekirk Vicarage, Cumberland. Apr 25. Hayton and Simpson, Cockermouth  
 COUSEY, JOHN, Holmesdale rd, South Norwood, Esq. May 1. Fraser, Farnival's inn  
 DALE, ALFRED, Leytonstone. Apr 30. King and Peto, Abchurch lane  
 DAWSON, DANIEL, Rochdale, Lancaster, Silk Mercer. May 1. Tyrer and Co, Liverpool  
 ECCLES, ANTHONY, Eyarth Hall, Denbigh, Esq. May 18. Collins and Co, Liverpool  
 EDWARDS, MARY ANN, Liverpool. Apr 26. Whitley and Co, Liverpool  
 EDWARDS, ROBERT CHARLES, Liverpool. Apr 23. Whitley and Co, Liverpool  
 FERNIVAL, JACOB, Royal Leamington Spa, Warwick, Esq. Apr 30. Southern, Royal Leamington Spa  
 FYLER, REV SAMUEL ANNOT, Cornhill, Northumberland. May 2. Jones, Durham  
 GOLDHAM, REV RICHARD, Lee, Kent, Clerk. June 14. Duffield and Brut, Tokenhouse yard  
 GORDON, ELIZABETH, Oadby, Leicester. May 1. Oliver and Sons, Carey st  
 HAGGER, FRANCIS, Warren st, Fitzroy sq. Apr 13. Smith and Wilmer, New sq  
 HAGGER, JAMES, Vinegar yard, St Giles South, Tallow Chandler. Apr 18. Smith and Wilmer, New sq, Lincoln's inn fields  
 HAGGER, JOSEPH, Brentford, Commercial Traveller. Apr 13. Smith and Wilmer, Lincoln's inn fields  
 HAGGER, LIDIA ELIZABETH, Warren st, Fitzroy sq. Apr 13. Smith and Wilmer, New square, Lincoln's inn  
 HAGGER, SAMSON, Warren st, Fitzroy sq. Apr 13. Smith and Wilmer, New sq, Lincoln's inn  
 HALLSALL, DANIEL, Sutton, St Helen's, Lancaster, Provision Dealer. May 5. Thomas, St Helens  
 HARRISON, CHARLES, Cheltenham, Gloucester, Gent. May 16. Griffiths, Cheltenham  
 JAMES, FREDERICK, Clifton, Bristol, Merchant. Apr 30. Peters, Bristol  
 JONES, ALEXANDER, Prince of Wales terrace, Kensington, Esq. Apr 14. Boxall and Boxall, Chancery lane  
 JONES, EVANS, Durham rd, Upper Holloway, Carpenter. Apr 14. Howard and Shelton, Threadneedle st  
 KEENE, REV CHARLES EDMUND ROCK, Swyncombe pk, Oxford, Clerk. Apr 30. Thompson and Debenham, Salters' hall court, Cannon st  
 KENYON, THOMAS, Wiltshire, nr Blackburn, Innkeeper. Apr 16. Wilkinson, Blackburn  
 KERBISON, HENRY JAMES, Beccles, Suffolk, Gent. Apr 30. Fiske, Beccles  
 LUCAS, EDWARD, Kingston upon Hull, Gold and Silversmith. May 3. Thorne, Hull  
 MARKE, JOHN, Cilrhedyn, Carmarthen, Farmer. Apr 23. George, Newcastle Emlyn  
 MARSH, WILLIAM RANICAR, Parkfield Atherton, nr Manchester, Gent. Apr 30. Taylor and Sons, Bolton  
 MOSE, HENRY, Ashton-juxta-Birmingham, Commercial Traveller. March 31. Lowe and Son, Birmingham  
 OWEN, ROBERT, Clifton House, nr Rotherham, York, Gent. June 20. Nicholson and Co, Wath, nr Rotherham  
 NORMAN, JOHN, Maryport, Cumberland, Gent. Apr 25. Hayton and Simpson, Cockermouth  
 PASCOE, HENRY, Torriano avenue, Camden rd, Gentleman. May 2. Watson, Southampton bldgs, Chancery lane

PESTON, EDWARD, Grange rd, Bermondsey, Builder. Apr 25. Wilkinson and Drew, Bermondsey st  
 SEATON, JOHN LOUIS, Hampstead rd, Upholsterer. Apr 18. Roscoe and Co, Kings st, Finsbury sq  
 SAUNDERS, GEORGE, Wallingford, Berks, Auctioneer. May 2. Hedges and Co, Wallingford  
 SHEPHERD, JAMES, Jeffry's sq, Ship and Insurance Broker. Apr 5. Gole, Lime st  
 SHIRWOOD, ELIZABETH, Birmingham, Pattern Card Maker. Apr 14. Robinson and Son, Birmingham  
 SIMCOATS, THOMAS, Anderley, Lincoln, Grazier. May 2. Caparn and Co, Holbeach  
 SKITT, JOHN, Stockwell, Surrey, Gent. June 14. Duffield and Brut, Tokenhouse yard  
 STACKHOUSE-ACTON, FRANCIS, Acton Scott, Salop. Apr 4. Salt, Shrewsbury  
 TAYLOR, WILLIAM, Birmingham, Jeweller. March 31. Turner, Birmingham  
 THOMPSON, FREDERICK, Wakefield, York, Corn Millers Engineer. July 1. Harrison and Beaumont, Wakefield  
 THOMPSON, SAMUEL, Skipworth, York, Farmer. Apr 23. Phillips, York  
 TOOGOOD, WILLIAM, Mount st, Grosvenor sq, Glass Merchant. May 1. Holmes and Co, Arundel  
 WEST, THOMAS, Worcester, Gent. May 19. Gillam and Sons, Worcester  
 WILD, THOMAS, Cold Eaton, Derby, Farmer. May 1. Holland and Rigby, Ashbott  
 WILLIAMS, WILLIAM, Lower Norwood, Surrey, Gent. Apr 15. Goodheart and Medcalf, Mining lane  
 WOODCOCK, MARTHA, Leeds, Eating house Keeper. Apr 18. Markland and Davy, Leeds  
 WORTHINGTON, MARK, Bramhall, Chester, Farmer. April 20. Kearsley and Co, Manchester  
 YOUNG, JANE, Fenon Wheeler, Northumberland, Domestic Servant. May 1. Gray, Berwick upon Tweed

[Gazette, Mar. 18.]

ACRAMAN, ALFRED JOHN, Gratton road West, Kensington Park, Official Assignee. Apr 30. Baileys and Co, Berners st  
 ANDERSON, MATTHEW, Jesmond, Newcastle upon Tyne. May 1. Griffith and Co, Newcastle upon Tyne  
 ASTON, WILLIAM, Birmingham, Manufacturing Jeweller. May 18. Pointon, Birmingham  
 BARROW, RICHARD, Newmarket St Mary, Suffolk, Veterinary Surgeon. Apr 30. Fern, Newmarket  
 BIRBY, SARAH, Chester terrace, Regent's Park, Domestic Servant. May 1. Lemon and Co, Lincoln's inn fields  
 BIGGS, ALFRED, Brighton, Gentleman. May 17. Poole, Bartholomew close  
 BIGGS, CHARLES BENNETT, Brighton, of no occupation. May 17. Poole, Bartholomew close  
 BLACKCO, WILLIAM, Latham, Lancaster. June 15. Whitaker, Lancaster pl, Strand  
 BLAKELEY, LUKE, Soothill, Dewsbury, Rag Merchant. Apr 30. Schofield and Taylor, Batley  
 CHASE, FRANCIS, Langthorpe, York, Farmer. Apr 16. West, Thirsk  
 CHAMOT, ALEXANDRE LOUIS, Boltons, South Kensington, Merchant. May 15. Munns and Longden, Old Jewry  
 CLARKE, JOHN, Peckham grove, Camberwell, Commercial Traveller. Apr 28. Parkes, Queen Victoria street  
 CONSTABLE, HENRY, Epsom, Surrey, Jockey. Apr 25. White, Epsom  
 DORRIST, REV JOHN, Turnham Green, Clerk. Apr 23. Biggis, Chancery lane  
 DORMAN, JOHN, Ashford, Kent, Tanner. Apr 30. Dorman, Sandwich  
 EDWARDS, ISAAC, Ebbw Vale, Monmouth, Beerhouse Keeper. May 1. Rice Harris, Tredegar  
 EDWARDS, MARY, Mostyn, Flint. May 31. Cope, Holywell  
 FAWCINGTON, THOMAS, Gate Fulford, York, Glass Painter. May 2. Newton and Co, York  
 HADGOD, JAMES, Bristol, Gentleman. Apr 21. Wise, Bristol  
 HUDSON, REV FRANK, Blackdown Manor, nr Kenilworth, Warwick, Clerk. Apr 30. Heath and Blenkinsop, Warwick  
 HUTT, THOMAS, Witton Gilbert, Durham, Builder. May 2. Proul, Bishop Auckland  
 LOVE, HARRIET BLAGRAVE DEANE, Yarmouth, Isle of Wight. Apr 17. Froeman and Bothamley, Queen street, Cheapside  
 MATHIAS, MARGARETTA LETITIA, Narberth, Pembroke. Mar 31. Eton and Co, Haverfordwest  
 MELBID, WILLIAM, Kingston upon Hull, Joiner. June 1. Peack, Hull  
 METCALF, WILLIAM, Settrington, York, Farmer. Apr 23. Jackson, Malton  
 NASH, JOHN, Reigate, Surrey, Gentleman. May 24. Head, Reigate  
 PAGE, ELIZABETH, Victoria square, Pimlico. Apr 20. Radcliffe and Co, Craven street, Charing cross  
 PISTOW, MARIA, Chelmsford, Essex. May 1. Albert Copland, Chelmsford  
 REASON, FRANCIS, Highworth, Wilts, Farmer. Apr 30. Kinneir and Toms, Swindon  
 ROBINSON, SAINT PETER, Huttoft, Lincoln, Farmer. May 15. Bourne and Rhodes, Alford  
 SCOFFMAN, JETHRO, Leomansey, Lichfield, retired Innkeeper. Apr 30. Barnes and Russell, Lichfield  
 SHERIFF, GEORGE WASHINGTON, Streatham, Surrey, Esq. Apr 11. Freeman and Bothamley, Queen street, Cheapside  
 SMITH, JOSEPH, West Bromwich, Stafford, Farmer. May 30. Caddick, West Bromwich  
 SMITH, WORDSWORTH, Rydal, Westmoreland, Esq. Apr 30. Sutton and Ommamney, Great Winchester street  
 STEWART, WILLIAM GEORGE, Albion grove, Barnsbury, Gentleman. May 18. Herbert, Vigo street, Regent street  
 THOMAS, DANIEL, Ebbw Vale, Monmouth, Pauper Lunatic. May 1. Harris, Tredegar

THOMAS, JENKIN, Lisworney, nr Cowbridge, Glamorgan, Farmer.  
 Apr 20. Davies, Neath  
 THOMAS, REV THOMAS ALFRED, Efenectyd, Denbigh, Clerk. May  
 1. Lloyd and Roberts, Ruthin  
 WELLS, JOSEPH, Sheffield, Silver Plater. Apr 18. Rodgers and  
 Co, Sheffield  
 WHITEHOUSE, MARY, Alrewas, nr Lichfield, Stafford. Apr 30.  
 Barnes and Russell, Lichfield  
 WICKS, EMILY, St Catharine's Plain, Norwich. June 1. Chittock  
 and Woods, Norwich  
 WILSON, JOHN, Scotby, Cumberland, Farmer. Apr 30. Hodgson,  
 Carlisle

Gazette, March 22.]

## LEGISLATION OF THE WEEK

## HOUSE OF LORDS.

## MARCH 24.—BILL IN COMMITTEE.

India Office (Sale of Superfluous Land).

## BILLS READ A THIRD TIME.

Crestal Palace, Oxford Police.

## MARCH 25.—BILL READ A THIRD TIME.

PRIVATE BILL.—Cambridge University Gas.

## MARCH 26.—BILL READ A FIRST TIME.

Consolidated Fund (No. 2).

## MARCH 28.—BILLS READ A SECOND TIME.

PRIVATE BILLS.—Allan's Estate, Cleveland Extension  
 Mineral Railway, Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire  
 Railway (Additional Powers).

Consolidated Fund Bill (No 2) (also read a third time).

## BILL READ A THIRD TIME.

PRIVATE BILL.—Penarth, Sully, and Barry Railway.

## MARCH 29.—ROYAL ASSENT.

The Royal Assent was given by Commission to the  
 following Bills:—Consolidated Fund (No. 2); Local  
 Taxation Returns (Scotland); India Office (Sale of Super-  
 fluous Land); Local Government Boards Provisional  
 Orders Confirmation (Godalming, &c.); Cambridge Uni-  
 versity and Town Gas.

## BILL READ A SECOND TIME.

PRIVATE BILL.—Synchronizing, Pneumatic, and Electric  
 Company.

## BILL READ A THIRD TIME.

PRIVATE BILL.—Lydd Railway.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

## MARCH 24.—BILLS IN COMMITTEE.

Consolidated Fund (No. 2), Bill of Sale Act Amendment.

## BILLS READ A THIRD TIME.

PRIVATE BILLS.—Bingley Water and Improvement,  
 Maidstone and Ashford Railway, Metropolitan District  
 Railway, Ryton Local Board (Water), Seacombe, Hoylake,  
 and Deeside Railway, Tyne Improvement.

## MARCH 25.—BILLS READ A THIRD TIME.

PRIVATE BILLS.—London, Chatham and Dover Railway  
 (City and Suburban Traffic Station), London, Chatham,  
 and Dover Railway (Further Powers), London, Chatham,  
 and Dover Railway (Maidstone and Faversham Junction).

## BILL READ A FIRST TIME.

Bill to appoint Additional Commissioners for executing  
 the Acts for granting a Land Tax and other Rates and  
 Taxes (Mr. J. Holmes).

## MARCH 28.—BILLS READ A SECOND TIME.

PRIVATE BILLS.—Brighton and Dyke Railway, Dudley  
 and Oldbury Junction Railway, South London Tramways,  
 West Lancashire Railway, Whitland and Cardigan Rail-  
 way.

## BILLS READ A THIRD TIME.

PRIVATE BILLS.—Burry Port and North-Western Junction  
 Railway, Great Eastern and East Norfolk Railway  
 Companies (New Title), Swindon and Cheltenham Extension  
 Railway, Richmond Gas, Tuckton Bridge.

## BILL READ A FIRST TIME.

Bill to amend the Agricultural Holdings Act, 1875 (Mr.  
 S. Hill).

## MARCH 29.—BILLS READ A THIRD TIME.

PRIVATE BILLS.—Australian Agricultural Company,  
 Fyde Water, Hancock's Patent, Hexham Gas.

## MARCH 30.—BILLS READ A SECOND TIME.

PRIVATE BILL.—Central Norfolk Railway.  
 Metropolitan Open Spaces Act (1877) Amendment, Muni-  
 cipal Corporations Act (1859) Amendment.

## COURT PAPERS.

## HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

## QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION.

LONDON.—HILARY SITTING, 1881.

This list contains all actions entered in the Queen's Bench  
 Division in which notice of trial has been given; and also all  
 actions in the Chancery Division, in which notice has been given  
 of trial before a judge and jury, up to and including 28th March,  
 1881.

The actions which have been entered but for various reasons are  
 at present not ready for trial are omitted from this list. Such of  
 them as become ready during the present sitting will be inserted as  
 nearly as possible in their original positions.

## LIST OF ACTIONS FOR TRIAL.

- 1 Borthwick (Van Sandau and C) v Peacock (H F Ward)
- 2 Corbin (Gard, C and H) v Powis (Combe and W)
- 3 Pilditch (L G W Godden) v Dimbleby (Smith, Davies and Co)
- 4 Rawes (W Brewer) v Temple (G Lockyer)
- 5 Berle, Cottrill and Co (Norton, R and Co) v E Pellas and Co  
 (Lowless and Co) SJ
- 6 Preston (Parker and Co) v The Cleveland Extension Miners'  
 Ry Co (Chappell, Sons and G) SJ
- 6a Sir John Pirie and Co (Same) v The Middle Dock Co (W A  
 Crump and Son) without jury
- 7 Lady Llanover (Freshfields and W) v Ebbw Vale Steel, &c, Co,  
 Id (Robinson, P and S) SJ
- 7a Lehmkuhl (R G Greening) v Blyth and Co (Houghton and B)
- 8 Cooper (F Cooper and Co) v Mellwraith and anr (Ingledew and  
 D)
- 9 Anderson (G and W Webb) v Brockelbank Shipping Co, Id  
 (Kisch, Son and H)
- 10 Irvine (Shum, C and Co) v Scrutton, Sons and Co (Nash and F)  
 SJ
- 11 Wingrove (Hilleary and T) v Tubbs and Lewis (Chapell, W and  
 Co) SJ
- 11a Harvey (W Bristow) v Wilcox (C F B Birchall)
- 12 Wright and anr (J T Moss) v London and St Kath Dock Co  
 (W M Hacon) SJ
- 13 Britneff (Hollams, Son and C) v Kinloch and Co (J Knight) SJ
- 14 Sutton (Dalton and Jessett) v Gt Eastern Ry Co (C A Curwood)
- 15 Holliday (G and W Webb) v Same (Same) SJ
- 16 Mackintosh (C O Humphreys and S) v Stewart (Gedge and Co)  
 SJ
- 17 Bakewell (J Rae) v Geen (W Beck)
- 18 Tambllyn (A M Bradley) v The City Bank (Ingle, C and H) SJ
- 19 London and County Banking Co (Harries, W and R) v Card (E  
 Woodard) SJ pt hd
- 19a Keeble (W F Morris) v Whitworth (Ashurst, M, C and Co)
- 20 Raggio (Lowless and Co) v Norrington and Co (F Needham)  
 SJ
- 21 Weigel (W Beck) v Mountain (Simpson and P) SJ
- 22 Dubois and anr (Miller and M) v Bishop (Lawrance, P and B)  
 SJ
- 23 Peterborough Patent Brick and Tile Co Id (A S Hatchett-Jones)  
 v Mills (Speechly and Co) SJ
- 24 Raffety (Tilleard, G and H) v North London Ry Co (Paines and  
 Co) SJ
- 25 Island City Savings Bank (Lyne and H) v Tully and anr  
 (Maples and Co) SJ
- 26 Weigel (W Beck) v Dyson (Wilson and Son)
- 27 Eialer (T Blair) v Bennet (White, B and W) SJ
- 28 Schneider (W Beck) v Ghioncas (W St Aubyn)
- 29 Bellison, Pere and Co (L Barnett) v Marsh and Meyers (J A  
 Hales, Kent and K)
- 30 Hutchinson (Tatham, Oblein and N) v The Army and Navy  
 Provision Market, Id (Birch and K) SJ
- 31 Batty (J E Carter) v Clever (G R Dodd)
- 32 Brown and anr (Ellis and Crossfield) v Marsh and anr (Ken  
 and K)
- 33 Bartling (Simpson and C) v Bartlett (Watson, Son and R)
- 34 With and anr (Ingledew and I) v Luff (B H Van Tromp)
- 35 Oliver and anr (Keene, M and B) v Dudin (Farnfields)
- 36 Stenning (Lowless and Co) v Kressman (Hollams, Son and C)  
 SJ
- 37 Porcas (Farnfields) v Hawthorn (Keene, M and B)
- 38 Phillips and anr (Johnsons, Upton and Co) v Savary, Young-  
 and Co (E Andrew) SJ
- 39 Clarkson (F Bradley) v North London Ry Co (Paines and Co)
- 40 Hayward (J Hayward) v Holloway and anr (Robinson, P and  
 S; Paddison, Son and T)
- 41 Leveaux (E Dow and Co) v Bertram (Ellis and Crossfield)
- 42 Dyball (T G Bullen) v Campbell (Levin and Co) SJ
- 43 Lown and Sons (R H Ward) v Bindoff and Co (J F Nutt and  
 Co)
- 44 Evans (Leary and Co) v North Met Tram Co (H C Godfray  
 SJ)
- 45 Colquhoun (G Clark) v Puleston and anr (Freshfields and W  
 SJ)
- 46 Gladstone (Simpson and C) v Broad's, Paterson and May (Link  
 Inters) SJ
- 47 Cavell and Wife (J T Moss) v London Tram Co (H C Godfray)  
 SJ
- 48 Foy and ors (J and R Gole) v Braid and anr (J Nicholls)
- 49 George (W Rawlins) v Dobson (J E Betts)
- 50 Kesterton (Dubois and R) v Lloyd's Banking Co, Id (Wragg, F  
 and Co)
- 51 Western Australia Guano Co and ors (R Greening) v Jenkins  
 and ors (Norris, Allens and Co) SJ
- 52 Searle (Woodin and W) v Palmer (Freeman and W)
- 53 Thompson (J Rae) v Hall (Carr, Son and T)
- 54 Townley (T Boulton) v North Metropolitan Tram Co (H  
 Godfray) SJ
- 55 Fardell (W R Preston) v Same (Same)

- 56 Watson and anr (Wolferstan, A and J) v Barker (J R Greening)  
57 Clarke (F Eastwood) v The Incorporated Society of Licensed Victuallers (H J and T Child)  
58 Westrope (Hollams, Son and C) v Olorenshaw (T W Palmer)  
59 Hansen (Billing and K) v Pecego (Hollams, Son and C) SJ  
60 Casey (J Neal) v Young, Eilers and Co (Flux, Slade and Co)  
61 Ryman (W F Morris) v Palmer (E Sweeting)  
62 Nolf (W Eley) v Garden (Pawle and Co)  
63 Fulwood (Dollman and P) v Umfreville (J T Moss)  
64 Barrow (H Montagu) v Phillips (Bellamy and Co)  
65 Matthiasson (Podmore and H) v Reid (Layton and J) SJ  
66 Miles, admr (Bristow and S) v Scammell (Randall and A)  
67 Templeman, by next Friend (G Rose Innes and Son) v Fairclough and Son (Stones, M and S) SJ  
68 Hamel (Edwd Lee) v Pratt (Lumley and L)  
69 Lake (A F Francis) v Millward (E W Owles)  
70 Johnson (G and W Webb) v Commercial Union Assnce Co and ors (Hollams, Son and C) SJ  
71 Apfel (J J Hutchingson) v Koenigswerther (J Sealey)  
72 Robbins (W H Cannon) v Metropolitan Ry Co (Burchells) SJ  
73 Fortescue (G and W Webb) v Stephens (S Whitehead)  
74 Evans (Montagu) v Beddall (Mercer and M) SJ  
75 Foster (A L Ansell) v Ward (Griffin and G)  
76 Howell and Co (Bell, Brodick and G) v Hogland and ors (Ingle, C and H) v Cunliffe, B and D) SJ  
77 Levy (Podmore and H) v Israel (J M Green)  
78 London and County Advance, &c, Co, lmd (Same) v Dainton (Sole, T and K)  
79 Dollar (W T Boydell) v Webster (W Rawlins) SJ  
80 Savary, Young and Co (E Andrew) v John Spencer and Sons (Gregory, R and Co) SJ  
81 Schaanning and ors (Plews, I and H) v Bennet Bros (Stocken and J)  
2 Christopher and ors, exors (J W Smart) v United Kingdom Electric Telegraph Co (Munnis and L) SJ  
83 Weddell (Weeks and Son) v North Metropolitan Tram Co (H C Godfray) SJ  
84 Hoare and anr (Hyde, T and M) v Hindley (W A Downing) SJ  
85 Brooman (Lindsay, Mason and G) v Childs (F G Cordwell)  
86 Louney (W E Teather) v Walker (Farnfields)  
87 Howard (Surr, G and B) v Thompson (J and E Scott and Co)  
(To be continued.)

## LONDON GAZETTES.

## BANKRUPTCY.

FRIDAY, March 25, 1881.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.  
To Surrender in London.

- Avenell, Alfred James, Plough st, Commercial rd, Packing Case Maker. Pet Mar 22. Murray. Apr 8 at 11.30  
Penstone, Joseph, 88 John's rd, Hoxton, Grocer. Pet Mar 23. Brougham. Apr 6 at 12.30  
To Surrender in the Country.  
Chinn, Charles, Coventry, Eating house Keeper. Pet Mar 21. Kirby. Coventry, Apr 6 at 2  
Drummond, George, Bradford, York, Stuff Manufacturer. Pet Mar 21. Lee. Bradford, Apr 8 at 12  
Gibson, William, Sheffield, Boot Maker. Pet Mar 21. Rodgers. Sheffield, Apr 6 at 1.30  
Gough, Richard, Pershore, Worcester, Licensed Victualler. Pet Mar 21. Beale. Worcester, Apr 6 at 11  
Kenyon, James Henry Turner, Ashborne, Derby, Veterinary Surgeon. Pet Mar 22. Hubbersty. Burton-on-Trent, Apr 6 at 1.30  
Smith, James, Bromyard, Hereford, Grocer. Pet Mar 21. Beale. Worcester, Apr 8 at 10.30  
Southern, Thomas William, Oldham, Lancaster, Licensed Victualler. Pet Mar 21. Tweedale. Oldham, Apr 6 at 11  
Stokes, John, Worcester, Builder. Pet Mar 21. Beale. Worcester, Apr 6 at 3  
To Surrender in the Country.  
Dunn, Robert, North Shields, out of business. Pet Mar 26. Ingledeu. Newcastle, Apr 11 at 11  
Gibson, William, Knaresborough, York, Innkeeper. Pet Mar 25. Perkins. York, Apr 11 at 11  
Jenkins, Edward, Govtre, Monmouth, Farmer. Pet Mar 25. Davis. Newport, Apr 11 at 11  
Marchant, William, Hythe, Kent, Coal Merchant. Pet Mar 25. Furley. Canterbury, Apr 22 at 12  
Rees, David, Swansea, Ironmonger. Pet Mar 25. Jones. Swansea, Apr 9 at 11  
Sears, James Cayford, Greenwich, Milk Dealer. Pet Mar 25. Pitt-Taylor. Greenwich, Apr 12 at 1  
Skelton, Joseph, Carlisle, Builder. Pet Mar 24. Hulton. Carlisle, Apr 12 at 2  
Sparks, Francis William, Addlestone, Surrey, Wine Merchant. Pet Mar 25. Bell. Kingston, Apr 25 at 4  
Youngs, William, Worlingworth, Suffolk. Pet Mar 23. Grimsey. Ipswich, Apr 12 at 11

## BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

FRIDAY, Mar. 25, 1881.

Chilton, A. T., New Basinghall st, Tie Manufacturer. Mar 25  
Penny, Charles Gregory, High Holborn, Glass Cutter. Mar 23

TUESDAY, Mar. 29, 1881.

Moorhead, Robert A., Newgate st, Commission Agent. Mar 23

## Liquidations by Arrangement.

## FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.

FRIDAY, March 25, 1881.

- Abson, Thomas, Barnsley, Butcher. April 5 at 3 at offices of Gray, Eastgate, Barnsley  
Alchin, William Thomas, Chigwell, Essex, Grocer. April 13 at 3 at offices of Cook and Smith, Adelaide bldgs, London Bridge. Duffield and Bruty, Tokenhouse yd  
Allen, Walter Harris, Winterborne Abbas, Dorset, Draper. April 7 at 3 at offices of Lock, High West st, Dorchester  
Baker, Henry John, Birmingham, Solicitor's Clerk. April 7 at 3 at offices of Duke, Temple row, Birmingham  
Ball, Catherine, Bilesworth, Northampton, Coal Merchant. April 8 at 11 at Angel Hotel, Peterborough. Hart  
Bedford, Arthur Charles, Wolverhampton, Builder. April 7 at 11 at offices of Rhodes, Queen st, Wolverhampton  
Bevan, William, Cwmtywrch, Brecon, Grocer. April 8 at 12 at offices of Leyson and Jones, Fisher st, Swansea  
Bibby, Lloyd, Liverpool, Boot Manufacturer. April 4 at 2 at offices of Fildes, North John st, Liverpool  
Blake, William, Snapeshorpe, nr Wakefield, Farmer. April 7 at 3 at offices of Marsden and Co, Westgate, Wakefield  
Boam, Joseph, Stamford, Lincoln, Coal Merchant. April 13 at 2 at offices of Wykes and Co, Friar lane, Leicester  
Boston, James, Stoke-upon-Trent, Stafford, Builder. April 6 at 11 at offices of Griffith, Lad lane, Newcastle-under-Lyme  
Bradshaw, James, Lower Ince, nr Wigan, Lancaster, Brickmaker. Apr 7 at 11 at offices of Johnson, Newsham bldgs, King st, Wigan  
Bramall, John, Alcewas, nr Lichfield, Carpenter. Apr 11 at 11 at offices of Stanley, Bridge st, Walsall  
Branson, Thomas, Buckingham, Farmer. Apr 2 at 12 at offices of Locke, St Giles st, Northampton  
Brown, Frank, Roughton, Norfolk, Farmer. Apr 2 at 11 at offices of Stanley, Bank Plain, Norwich  
Brown, William Henry, Luton, Kent, Coal Merchant. Apr 4 at 3 at the King's Head Hotel, High st, Rochester. Shakespears, Southampton bldgs, Chancery lane  
Bruce, Frank, Heckmondwike, York, Carrier. Apr 8 at 3 at offices of Sykes, Heckmondwike  
Bull, Richard, Carlisle, Grocer. Apr 11 at 3 at the Lion and Lamb Hotel, Scotch st, Carlisle. Wannon, Carlisle  
Burland, Charles, Manchester, Merchant. Apr 8 at 3 at offices of Earle and Co, Brown st, Manchester  
Campkin, Joseph Stockbridge, and Walter Charles Campkin, Malbourn, Cambridge, Grocers. Apr 11 at 12 at 145, Cheapside, Nash, Royston  
Carter, Richard Thomas, Blackstone road, London Fields, Builder. Apr 8 at 2 at offices of Beall, Queen Victoria st  
Castle John, jun, Worksope, Nottingham, Coach Builder. Apr 8 at 3 at the Corn Exchange, Worksope. Whall  
Cawsey, Charles, Northam, Devon, Butcher. Apr 6 at 12 at offices of Rooker and Bazely, Bridgland st, Bideford  
Chadwick, Wright Skippin, Park st, Islington, Machinist. April 4 at 390, City rd, Islington. Popham, Vincent ter, Islington  
Childs, Samuel, Bath, Fruiterer. April 5 at 11 at Christopher Hotel, Market pl, Bath. Bartrum and Bartlett  
Crank, Charles, jun, Shrewsbury, Salop, Grocer. April 8 at 12 at Crown Hotel, Shrewsbury  
Cull, Thomas, Cheltenham, Plumber. April 7 at 3 at offices of Pruen Regent st, Cheltenham  
Cumliffe, William, Rochdale, Grocer. April 11 at 3 at offices of Jackson, Lower gates, Rochdale  
Curtis, George Henry, Gloucester, Steam Tug Agent. April 6 at 3 at Bell Hotel, Gloucester. Taynton and Sons, Gloucester  
Dicks, Alfred, Wolverhampton, Draper. April 12 at 2 at Great Western Hotel, Monmouth st, Birmingham. Wilcock, Wolverhampton  
Dixon, William, Horncastle, Lincoln, Butcher. April 5 at 12 at Corn Exchange Hall, Horncastle. Tweed, Horncastle  
Eley, Samuel, Derby, Baker. April 11 at 3 at 7, Corn Market, Derby. Close, Derby  
Eva, James Richard, and Frederick William Eva, Penzance, House Decorators. April 7 at 11 at offices of Trythall and Bodilly, Clarence st, Penzance  
Fletcher, Joshua, Crowland, Lincoln, Farmer. April 6 at 12 at White Lion Hotel, Spalding. Calthorp, Spalding  
Foulkes, Thomas, Mold, Flint, Builder. April 2 at 2 at the Albion Hotel, Railway Station, Chester. Roper, Mold  
Gambold, John, Dowlaia, Glamorgan, Outfitter. April 7 at 12 at the Merchants' Association, 30, Broad st, Bristol. James and Co, Merthyr Tydfil  
Gillard, James, Bridgwater, Somerset, Coachbuilder. April 6 at 1 at the Talbot Hotel, Victoria st, Bristol. Boulting, Bridgwater  
Gittings, John, Oldbury, Worcester, Ironmaster. April 7 at 3 at the Queen's Hotel, Stephenson pl, Birmingham. Shakespears, Oldbury  
Golby, George, Cropredy, Oxford, Coal Merchant. Apr 8 at 11 at the White Lion Hotel, Banbury. Apkin, Banbury  
Greenwood, Ebenezer, Tudor rd, Hackney, Brush Manufacturer. April 2 at 10 at offices of Hughes and Co, 19, Leicester sq  
Greenwood, Joseph, Barnsley, York, Beerhouse Keeper. April 13 at 4 at offices of Rideal, Chronicle chmbrs, Barnsley  
Grimes, James, Leicester, out of business. April 7 at 12 at offices of Hunter and Curtis, 13, Halford st, Leicester  
Gunning, William Hooper, Brighton, Fancy Dealer. April 6 at 12 at offices of Edmonds and Co, 58, Cheapside, Lamb and Eve, Brighton



Hadley, John, Kinnarsley, Severn Stoke, Worcester, Farmer. Apr 7 at 3 at the Three Tuns Hotel, Pershore. Pace, Pershore.  
 Hampson, William, Pendleton, Manchester, Beerhouse Keeper. April 11 at 3 at offices of Stevenson, Ward's bridge, Deansgate, Manchester.  
 Hargreaves, John Parker, Accrington, Timber Merchant. April 7 at 10.30 at Railway Hotel, Accrington. Ballard, Accrington.  
 Harrison, Edward, Scarborough, Civil Engineer. April 12 at 12 at offices of Moody and Co, St Thomas st, Scarborough.  
 Harrison, John, North Shields, Grocer. April 7 at 2.30 at offices of Deichan and Co, Seville st, North Shields. Leitch and Co, North Shields.  
 Howard, Charles Stephen, Ipswich, Grocer. April 13 at 12 at Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st. Jones and Son, Colchester.  
 Herberson, Robert, Bulman's Village, Northumberland, Poultry Dealer. April 4 at 2 at offices of Benning, High st, Gateshead-on-Tyne.  
 Hinge, William, Ashborne, Derby, Innkeeper. April 4 at 12 at Wheat Sheaf Hotel, Ashborne. Brittlebank, Ashborne.  
 Holman, Richard Albert, George st, Portman sq, Cabinet Maker. April 2 at 1 at Inns of Court Hotel, High Holborn. Chapman, Southampton bridge, Chancery lane.  
 Hood, Charles, Scarborough, Grocer. April 13 at 3 at offices of Wilkenson, Queen st, Scarborough.  
 Hopkins, Charles, and Alfred Crellyn, Liverpool, Boot Manufacturers. April 8 at 2 at offices of Blackhurst and Fretson, Dale st, Liverpool.  
 Hopkins, George, and William Joseph McLean Bailey, Liverpool, Iron and Tin Plate Merchants. April 6 at 2 at offices of Harwood and Co, North John st, Huddersfield. Stone and Co, Liverpool.  
 Horne, Ralph, Newton, Chester, Prime Manufacturer. April 8 at 3 at offices of Rayner and Turner, Booth st, Manchester.  
 Horrobin, William, Chorlton-on-Medlock, Manchester, Slater. April 6 at 3 at offices of Gardner, Cooper st, Manchester.  
 Jenkins, Charles, Pontypriid, Glamorgan, Engineer. April 8 at 11 at offices of Davies, Mill st, Pontypriid.  
 Johnson, Frederick William, Leicester, Auctioneer. April 6 at 3 at offices of Hincks, Bowling Green st, Leicester.  
 Kent, Philip, Three Bridges, Sussex, Builder. April 12 at 2.30 at offices of Fearless and Beeching, Tunbridge Wells.  
 Kinder, James, Ascote, Northampton, Grocer. April 8 at 3 at offices of Sheppard, Towcester.  
 King, Henry, Oxford, Publican. April 11 at 10 at offices of Druce, High st, Oxford.  
 Lancaster, Thomas Bedson, Tue Brook, nr Liverpool, Commercial Traveller. April 13 at 12 at offices of Paynter, South Castle st, Liverpool.  
 Langdon, William York, Exeter, Lodging House Keeper. April 8 at 3.30 at Craven Hotel, Craven st, Strand. Friend, Exeter.  
 Lee, George, Herne Bay, Civil Engineer. April 7 at 2 at offices of Dawson, Hart st, Bloomsbury sq.  
 Manderson, Charles, Cardiff, Printer. April 5 at 12 at offices of Morgan and Scott, High st, Cardiff.  
 Manning, James, St Mark's rd, Hanwell, out of business. April 7 at 3 at offices of Reader, Holborn Viaduct.  
 Marshall, James, Ugborough, Devon, Farmer. April 9 at 1.30 at King's Arms Hotel, Fore st, Ivybridge. Nepean, Ivybridge.  
 Micklewright, Henry Arthur, Crampton, Innkeeper. April 8 at 11 at offices of Jones, Market sq, Llandoverly.  
 Mills, Henry Valentine, Dymock, Gloucester, Grocer. April 2 at 3 at offices of Champigny, College st, Gloucester.  
 Miller, John, Cheetham Hill, Manchester, Gent. April 12 at 3 at the Kings Arms Hotel, Manchester. Woodall and Marriott, Manchester.  
 Mitchell, Francis, Lambley, Northumberland, Grocer. April 11 at 12 at offices of Pruddah, Hexham.  
 Mounfield, James, Sankey bridge, Warrington, Lancaster, Grocer. April 6 at 11 at offices of Ridgway and Worsley, Cairo st, chmbrs, Cairo st, Warrington.  
 Messing, Charles, Lower Sloane st, Chelsea, Plumber. April 7 at 3 at 45, Chancery lane. Roberts, Thaxet pl, Strand.  
 Mew, Edwin, Bognor, Sussex, Wine and Spirit Merchant. April 8 at 12 at the Guildhall Tavern, Basinghall st, Nye, Brighton.  
 Nicholl, Abraham, Halifax, Tailor. April 12 at 11 at the Halifax and District Creditors Association, Crown st, Halifax.  
 Nicholls, Phillip, Nurdan hall, Gloucester, Collier. March 31 at 12 at offices of Goldring, Cinderford.  
 Nurse, Joseph, Tasman road, Stockwell, Stone Merchant. April 8 at 3 at 7 Gt James st. Spencer and Co.  
 Oslons, Edwin, Tipton, Stafford, out of business. April 6 at 12 at offices of Hartill, Birmingham st, Oldbury.  
 Partridge, John, Bow, Devon, Farmer. April 9 at 3 at offices of Fryer, Gandy st, Exeter.  
 Perkins, Benjamin, jun, Benjamin Perkins, jun, Richard Perkins, and Charles Perkins, Darlaston, Stafford, Nut and Bolt Manufacturer. April 8 at 11 at offices of Slater and Marshall, Buteroff Darlaston.  
 Pike, Oswald, Manchester, Button Manufacturer. April 7 at 3 at offices of Jones, Kennedy st, Manchester.  
 Pike, William Henry, St Thomas the Apostle, Devon, Painter. April 5 at 3 at offices of Brown, High st, Exeter.  
 Rockington, Richard, Snaith, York, Coal Dealer. April 9 at 11 at Royal Hotel, Wood st, Wakefield. Clark, Snaith.  
 Roder, Francis, Westwood Park, Nottingham, Farmer. April 9 at 12 at offices of Williams, jun, Clinton st, Nottingham.  
 Rowles, Evelyn Ward, Sidcup, Kent, Gent. April 8 at 12 at offices of Liggins, Berners st, Oxford.  
 Pring, William, Honiton, Devon, Hotel Keeper. April 9 at 4 at Black Lion Inn, Honiton. Every.  
 Procter, William, Skerton, Lancaster, Innkeeper. April 7 at 2 at offices of Johnson and Tilly, Sun st, Lancaster.  
 Rave, Benjamin, Bury St Edmunds, Miller. April 11 at 12 at Guildhall, Bury St Edmunds. Gross.  
 Ray, James, Romford, Essex, Farmer. April 4 at 12 at offices of Preston, Mark.  
 Roberts, James Merrington, Upper Kennington lane, Scene Artist. April 14 at 3 at offices of Cordwell, Moorgate st.  
 Rogers, John, Brierley Hill, Stafford, Grocer. April 9 at 11 at

Great Western Hotel, Snowhill, Birmingham. Waldron, Brierley hill.  
 Raggles, John, Brentwood, Essex, Builder. Mar 31 at 3 at offices of Noton, Lombard st.  
 Raston, Edward, Lime st, East India Merchant. April 13 at 1 at offices of Spain and Co, Gresham bridge, Basinghall st. Hollams and Co, Mining lane.  
 Scanlon, Charles Henry, Leek, Stafford, Innkeeper. April 6 at 3 at offices of Bloor, Stockwell st, Leek. Redfern, Leek.  
 Shuteleworth, James, Skipton, York, Draper. April 8 at 3 at offices of Weston and Postlethwaite, Park row, Leeds.  
 Simons, Charles Penrose, Carlisle, Hat Manufacturer. April 6 at 3 at offices of Wannop, Scotch st, Carlisle.  
 Stoddard, Mary, Grindon, Stafford, Innkeeper. April 7 at 2 at offices of Redfern and Son, Church lane, Leek.  
 Stones, John, Clowne, Derby, Miner. April 1 at 3 at offices of Binney and Co, Queen st chmbrs, Sheffield.  
 Sugden, Walter, Agbrigg, near Wakefield, Vessel Owner. April 7 at 11 at offices of Mander and Son, Crown ct, Wakefield.  
 Talbot, John, and Edward Large, Birmingham, Bedstead Manufacturers. April 8 at 11 at offices of Burton, Union passage, Birmingham.  
 Taylor, Henry, Fenn, Devon, Baker. April 6 at 11 at offices of Southcott, Post Office st, Bedford circus. Exeter.  
 Taylor, John, Eckington, Worcester, Gardener. April 7 at 2 at offices of Pace, Bridge st, Pershore.  
 Tombs, William James, Gloucester, Coal Merchant. April 6 at 11 at offices of Franklin, Berkeley st, Gloucester.  
 Tripp, Samuel, Clerkenwell green, Carman. April 8 at 3 at offices of Parkes, Queen Victoria st.  
 Wagon, Edward, Woolwich, Grocer. April 8 at 12 at the Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st, London.  
 Waite, George, Cinderford, Gloucester, Draper. March 30 at 9 at offices of Parsons, High st, Bristol. Parker, Newnham.  
 Wakefield, William Twycross, Stoneleigh, Warwick, Farmer. April 8 at 3 at offices of Minster, Trinity churchyard, Coventry.  
 Walker, John, Wolthamscote, Warwick, Farmer. April 8 at 3 at offices of Wood, Southam.  
 Wall, George, Orleton, Hereford, Cattle Salesman. April 13 at 11 at the Blue Boar Inn, Mill st, Ludlow. Bowles, Ludlow.  
 Walley, John, Loughborough, Leicester, out of business. April 8 at 12 at offices of Gode, Baxter gate, Loughborough.  
 Washington, Thomas, Halifax, Bath Proprietor. April 8 at 11 at offices of Ingram and Huntress, Hopwood lane, Halifax.  
 Wells, Dudley, Upper Tulse hill, nat in business. April 6 at 12 at offices of Wickens, Pinnerston bridge, Old Broad st.  
 Welsford, Henry, Exeter, Stationer. April 6 at 11 at the Queen's Hotel, Queen st, Exeter. Ford, Exeter.  
 Wigley, Henry, and Septimus Wigley, Birmingham, Factors. April 8 at 12 at offices of Beale and Co, Waterloo st, Birmingham.  
 Wildman, James Joseph, Bedford, Tailor. April 8 at 12 at George Williams, Alfred, Heath Town, nr Wolverhampton, Grocer. April 7 at 3 at offices of Rhodes, Queen st, Wolverhampton.  
 Williams, William, Liverpool, Draper. April 6 at 2 at offices of Fildes, North John st, Liverpool.  
 Willis, Charles, Barkingaside, Essex, Market Gardener. April 20 at 12 at 11, Finsbury-square bridge, Chiswell st.  
 Wray, Francis, Nottingham, Joiner. April 11 at 3 at offices of Elborne, Brougham chmbrs, Wheeler gate, Nottingham.  
 Yates, Charles Broomfield, Bembridge, Isle of Wight, Butcher. April 7 at 3 at the Cambrian House Offices, Market st, Ryde.  
 Farield.  
 Yates, John, Hulme, Manchester, Baker. April 8 at 11 at offices of Lawson, Peter st, Manchester.

TUESDAY, MAR. 29, 1881.

Achinson, George, Rochdale, Lancaster, Haberdasher. April 8 at 3 at offices of Moleworth, Central-chambers, the Walk, Rochdale.  
 Armstrong, Patrick, Manchester, Slate Merchant. April 20 at 3 at Dog and Partridge Hotel, Fennel st, Manchester. Brett and Craven, Manchester.  
 Balding, Richard Thomas, Manor st, Clapham, Commission Agent. April 5 at 12 offices of Edwards and Craney, Broad st bridge, Matthews and Wells, John st, Bedford row.  
 Batkip, Joseph, Birmingham, Black Ornament Manufacturer. April 11 at 3 at offices Southall and Co, Waterloo st, Birmingham.  
 Battam, Charles, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Cabinet Maker. April 13 at 3 at Borough Arms Hotel, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Llewellyn and Ackrill, Tunstall.  
 Beeson, John, High Wycombe, Buckingham, Baker. April 11 at 11 at Coffee Tavern, Frogmore gardens, High Wycombe, Clarke, High Wycombe.  
 Benjafield, Uri, Gillingham, Dorset, Farmer. April 9 at 3 at offices of Rutter and Son, Bell st, Shaftesbury.  
 Berry, Titus and Joseph Berry, Cleckheaton, York, Flannel Manufacturers. April 12 at 3 at Punch Bowl Inn, Cleckheaton, Curry, Cleckheaton.  
 Bestwick, Agnes, Chorlton-upon-Medlock, Manchester, Provision Dealer. April 14 at 3 at offices of Farrington and Crofton, Mosley st, Manchester.  
 Big, George Franklyn, Ickham, Kent, Fodder Dealer. April 8 at Queen's Head Inn, Canterbury. Sankey, Son and Co, Canterbury.  
 Bondfield, William, jun, Kendal, Wheelwright. April 13 at 10 at offices of Dobson, Finkle st, Kendal.  
 Boycott, William, Hartlebury, Worcester, Tin Roller. April 11 at 3 at offices of Thurstfield, Swan st, Kidderminster.  
 Brown, Thomas, Hilderthorpe, York, Timber Merchant. April 14 at 2 at Imperial Hotel, Paragon st, Kingston-upon-Hull. Richardson, Bridlington.  
 Buckley, George, Hanley, Commission Agent. April 12 at 11 at office of Ashmall, Albion st, Leeds.  
 Bunn, George, Newton-by-Middlewich, Chester, Shoemaker. April 7 at 11 at Albert chmbrs, Church side, Crewe. Pounton.  
 Bunnett, Arthur Edward, Ramsgate, Kent, Teacher of Music.

- April 11 at 10.30 at Inns of Court Hotel, Holborn. Sutton, Norwich
- Burt, John, Trentham, Stafford, Grocer. April 9 at 11 at offices of Ashwell, Gleebe st, Stoke-upon-Trent
- Carey, Arthur, Halton, Hastings, Builder. April 14 at 4 at Provincial Hotel, Hastings. Hare, Finer's ct, Old Broad st
- Catford, Maria, Maidland Park rd, Haverstock hill, Lodging house keeper. April 6 at 10 at Eagle Hotel, Ladbroke Grove rd, North Kensington. Hanley, Acton
- Catterall, Thomas, Brighton, Confectioner. April 15 at 3 at offices of Upperton and Bacon, Pavilion bldgs, Brighton
- Champion, John, Burton Stather, nr Brigg, Lincoln, Saddler. April 11 at 11 at Angel Inn, Brigg. Stephenson and Mountain, Great Grimsby
- Chatterton, Henry William, Gracechurch st, Wholesale Tea Merchant April 6 at 3 at offices of Noton, Lombard st
- Church, George, Marks Tey, Essex, Farmer. April 11 at 3 at offices of Prior, Head st, Colchester
- Clark, Frederick Edward, Brighton, out of business. April 12 at 3 at offices of Nye, North st, Brighton
- Coles, Alfred Henry, Clevedon, Somersetshire, Tailor. April 9 at 12 at offices of Ware, Corn st, Bristol
- Combes, Hannah, Oldham, Lancashire, Grocer. April 13 at 3 at offices of Davies, Clegg st, Oldham
- Corbett, John, Little Earl st, Scho, Cheesemonger. April 11 at 3 at offices of Aird, Eastcheap
- Coxhead, Frederick John, West Ferry rd, Milwall, Barge Builder. April 13 at 3 at Mullen's Hotel, Ironmonger lane. Hulbert, Coleman st
- Croft, William, Sunbury, Brewer. April 20 at 11 at offices of Sherrard, Lincoln's-inn-fields
- Crowfoot, George, Halton rd, Canonbury, Baker. April 8 at 2 at offices of Moore, Mark lane
- Downs, William Bottam, Russell st, Bermondsey, Builder. April 14 at 3 at the Law Institution, Chancery lane. Davies, Southampton bldgs
- Drake, William, West Meon, nr Petersfield, Hants, Grocer. April 11 at 2 at offices of Blewitt and Tyler, Gracechurch st
- Eaton, Henry James, Wolverhampton, Gas Fitter. April 13 at 11.30 at offices of Dent and Son, Darlington st, Wolverhampton
- Eaton, Thomas, Basing pl, Kingsland rd, Builder. April 13 at 2 at 56, Bishopsgate st Within. Chandler, Bishopsgate st Within
- Ellis, John, and Charles William James Morris, Reading, Berks, Wholesale Clothiers. April 12 at 3 at the Queen's Hotel, Leeds. Blandy and Witherington, Reading
- Evans, Benjamin Abel, Heolfach, Ystradgofdwg, Glamorgan, Grocer. April 14 at 12 at offices of Collins, Broad st, Bristol. Lewis, Pontypridd
- Evans, Thomas, Abernman, Glamorgan, Licensed Victualler. April 12 at 11 at the Black Lion Hotel, Aberdare. Lewis and Jones, Merthyr Tydfil
- Fermor-Isaac, Golden Fleece yard, Minorities, Wholesale Clothier. April 5 at 12 at offices of Ladbury and Co, Cheapside. Young and Sons, Mark lane
- Fletcher, Peter Thomas, Manchester, India Rubber Dealer. April 12 at 3 at offices of Boote and Edgar, Booth st, Manchester
- Gannon, Joseph, Kings Norton, Worcester, General Dealer. April 8 at 3 at offices of Fallows, Cherry st, Birmingham
- Glover, Daniel, Sireton, Chester, Farmer. April 12 at 3 at offices of Ashton and Woods, Horsemarket st, Warrington
- Goddard, Thomas, Lower Marsh, Lambeth, Baker. April 11 at 3 at offices of Beard and Sons, Basinghall st
- Gomersall, John, Liversedge, York, Cabinet Maker. April 11 at 11 at offices of Curry, Cleekeaton
- Grainger, James, Old Kent rd, Oil and Colour Man. April 7 at 3 at No. 11, Ironmonger lane. White, Queen st, Cannon st
- Habgood, James, Poole, Boot Manufacturer. April 13 at 12 at offices of Aldridge and Aldridge, King st, Poole
- Hackwood, William Eliakin, Wednesbury, Stafford, Basket Maker. April 13 at 12 at offices of Duignan and Co, The Bridge, Walsall
- Handley, Robert Henry, Bishopston, Gloucester, Commission Agent. April 6 at 12 at offices of Sprod, John street, Bristol. Essery, Bristol
- Harrison, Thomas, Kirkdale, Liverpool, out of business. April 9 at 11 at offices of Lowe, Mount pleasant, Liverpool
- Hebdtich, William, and Martha Temperton, West Butterwick, Lincoln, Licensed Victuallers. April 6 at 12 at the Three Horse Shoes Inn, West Butterwick. Pearson and Burtonshaw, Crowle
- Helm, John, Liverpool, Licensed Victualler. April 9 at 1 at offices of Lowe, Mount pleasant, Liverpool
- Hill, James Fisher, and Matthew William Ainsley, Kingsland rd, Shoreditch, Auctioneers. April 14 at 3 at offices of Wildecumbe, Union st, Old Broad st
- Hinton, John, Market Drayton, Salop, Saddler. April 9 at 11.30 at the Royal Hotel, Nantwich road, Crewe. Pearson, Market Drayton
- Hodgson, Thomas Leeds, Commercial Traveller. April 8 at 3 at offices of Wells, Cockridge st, Leeds
- Holland, William Arthur, Birmingham, General Factor. April 11 at 3 at offices of Jacques, Temple row, Birmingham
- Hope, Joseph, Ashley, Stafford, Chemist. April 12 at 11 at the Meynell Arms Inn, Ashley. Onions, Market Drayton
- Horsfall, Thomas Edwin, Leeds, out of business. April 11 at 3 at offices of Dunn and French, East parade, Leeds
- Hough, William, Stockton, Warwick, Railway Porter. April 9 at 11.30 at the White Lion Hotel, Banbury. Wood, Southam
- Jackson, Samuel, Bradford, York, Builder. April 5 at 11 at offices of Beverley, Haslegrave, Bradford
- Jones, Frederick, Manchester, Cotton Spinner. April 13 at 12.30 at offices of Hall and Co, Fountain st, Manchester
- Jones, Walter David, Harbottle, Stafford, out of business. April 6 at 3 at offices of Parry, Colemore row, Birmingham
- Kay, John William, Middleton, Lancaster, Greengrocer. April 11 at 3 at the Falstaff Hotel, Market place, Manchester. Sims, Manchester
- Lambert, Mark, Accrington, Lancashire, Journeyman Blacksmith. April 5 at 3 at offices of Riley, Abbey st, Accrington. Sharples, Accrington
- Letts, William, Leicester, Plasterer. April 11 at 3 at offices of Wright Belvoir st
- Lewis, John, Begulidy, Radnor, Farmer. April 12 at 12.30 at offices of Wootman, High st, Newtown
- Lloyd, John, Battersea sq, Battersea, Hot Water Engineer. April 9 at 12 at offices of Pamphilon, John st, Adelphi
- Lockwood, John, Dewsbury, out of business. April 6 at 3 at offices of Mitcheson, Carlton st, Batley
- Lockwood, Joshua, Guiseley, York, Plumber. April 6 at 3 at offices of Lodge and Rhodes, Park row, Leeds
- Long, Philip Augustine, East Hanney, Berks, Baker. April 12 at 12 at offices of Jotcham, Wantage
- Moren, Henry, Goudhurst, Kent, Farmer. April 1 at 2 at Bull Inn, Cranbrook. Hinds and Son, Goudhurst
- Moulds, Henry, Harby, Leicestershire, out of business. April 11 at 11 at offices of Barton and Co, Long row, Nottingham
- Nicholls, Samuel, Hurst, nr Reading, Berks, Brewer. April 11 at 11 at offices of Newman, Friar st, Reading
- North, Ernest Michael Willey, Great Grimsby, Lincoln, Marine Store Dealer. April 19 at 3 at Yarboro' Hotel, Bethlehem st, Great Grimsby. Mason, Great Grimsby
- Ormes, Thomas Phillips, Kingston-on-Thames, Oilman. April 12 at 2 at offices of Morphet, King st, Cheapside. Terry, King st, Cheapside
- Owen, Thomas, Llandudno, Carnarvon, of no occupation. April 12 at 2 at the Burlington Hotel, Mostyn st, Llandudno. Churchill, Llandudno
- Owens, William Thomas, Everton, Liverpool, Builder. April 13 at 2 at offices of Knowles, Cook st, Liverpool
- Parrott, William, Birmingham, Wine Merchant. April 12 at 3 at offices of Chirm and New, Waterloo st, Birmingham
- Paton, John Green, Barrow-in-Furness, Lancashire, Horehound Beer Manufacturer. April 7 at 11 at the Trevelyan Temperance Hotel, Church st, Barrow-in-Furness. Sims, Barrow-in-Furness
- Pennington, John, Moulton, Lincoln, Farmer. April 14 at 11 at offices of Caparn, H Beach
- Resworthe, Edward, Eastville, Gloucester, Baker. April 7 at 3 at offices of Brown, Corn st, Bristol
- Rhodes, Elijah, Builder, Hockley Heath. April 8 at 3 at offices of Arnold and Son, Temple row, Birmingham
- Richardson, Thomas, White Hart lane, Barnes, Grocer. April 8 at 3 at offices of Spain Brothers, 1 Gresham bldgs, Basinghall st, Hawksford, King st, Cheapside
- Roberts, George, Foster lane, Cheapside, Warehouseman. April 11 at 12 at offices of Plunket and Leader, 60, St. Paul's Churchyard
- Rose, David, Moxley, Stafford, Ironmaster. April 11 at 12 at Queens Hotel, Birmingham. Duignan and Co
- Rose, John, New Church rd, Camberwell, Surrey. April 6 at 12 at offices of Geaussen, Bishopsgate st Without
- Sanders, James, Grange rd, Bermondsey, Baker. April 11 at 4 at offices of Young and Son, Mark lane
- Sinclair, Jane, North Shields, Grocer. April 11 at 3 at offices of Fenwick, Seville st, North Shields
- Singer, Theophilus, Hutton Garden, Restaurant Keeper. April 11 at 3 at offices of Thomson and Co, Cornhill
- Smith, Alfred Cooper, Hinckley, Leicester, Hosiery Manufacturer. April 11 at 3 at offices of Trade Protection Society, New st, Leicester
- Smith, Learyard and Co, Huddersfield
- Smith, George, Bath, Commission Agent. March 30 at 3 at offices of Tyzack, York st, Bath
- Spence, Richard, Leeds, Painter. April 6 at 3 at Law Institution, Albion pl, Leeds. Watson, Leeds
- Stannanought, Richard, Aigburth Vale, nr Liverpool, Contractor. April 14 at 11 at offices of Miller and Co, Eberle st, Liverpool
- Stephens, Richard, Penzance, Carpenter. April 11 at 11 at offices of Dale, Parade st, Penzance
- Stout, John, Hulme, Lancaster, Draper. April 13 at 3 at offices of Simpson and Hookin, Mount st, Albert sq, Manchester
- Sumner, James, Stockton, Tees, Tobaccoist. April 8 at 11 at offices of Dodd and Co, Finkle st, Stockton-on-Tees
- Sumner, Joseph Edward, Hastings, Grocer. April 13 at 1 at offices of Hewitt, York bldgs, Hastings
- Temple, Richard Pearce, George Bray, and Thomas Edward Forster, Paddington, Builders. April 13 at 12 at offices of Wing and Co, Princes st, Bank. Peace and Waller, Grocer's Hall ct, Townsend, James, and George Downs, Bristol, Carpenters. April 6 at 2 at offices of Phillips, Smail st, Bristol. Sibley, Bristol
- Trehearn, William Thomas, and William Parry, Rhyll, Flint, Painters. April 22 at 12 at Stork Hotel, Queen sq, Liverpool. Roberts, Rhyll
- Tupper, Samuel, Leyland rd, Hatcham Park, Hoop Bender. April 9 at 11 at Old Miller of Mansfield, Snow's fields, Bermondsey. Hicks, Victoria Park rd
- Tyler, Ambrose, Loughborough, Baker. April 11 at 12 at offices of Bartlett, Mill st, Loughborough
- Vick, Uriah Christopher, Bonnet grove, Wandsworth rd, Painter. April 11 at 12 at offices of Mann, Essex st, Strand
- Wale, Jane Margaret, Leicester, Watchmaker. April 11 at 3.30 at offices of Wright, Gallowtree Gate, Leicester
- Walkden, James, Pendleton, Lancaster, Baker. April 13 at 3 at offices of Kites and Grundy, Princess st, Manchester
- Waters, Robert, Lynsted, Kent, Fruiterer. April 12 at 11 at offices of Gibson, High st, Sittingbourne
- Weichert, Sigmund, Cardiff, Hat Manufacturer. April 11 at 3 at offices of Hearn, St Mary st, Cardiff. Stephens, Cardiff
- Weston, Lewis Warren, Bethnal Green rd, Baker. April 13 at 2 at offices of Brown, Basinghall st
- Wheeler, William Ewer, Kingston, Oxford, Farmer. April 13 at 11 at Crown and Cushion Hotel, Chipping Norton. Wilkins, Chipping Norton
- Whitaker, John Weston, Henlow, Bedford, Brewer. April 13 at 4.30 at offices of Hooper and Co, Biggleswade, Beds
- Williams, Thomas, Warrington, Lancaster, General Broker. April 11 at 11 at offices of Addenbrooke, Bank chambers, Warwick st, Warrington
- Winter, Samuel, and John Winter, Ship and Boat Builders, Cobholm Island, Gt Yarmouth. April 8 at 12 at offices of Wiltshire, South Quay, Gt Yarmouth

Wine, Henry, Colchester st, Mimico, Greengrocer. April 12 at 2 at  
 offices of Bartrum, Old Jewry Chambers  
 Wolfe, John, Kensington gardens sq, out of employment. April 9  
 at 3 at offices of Ley and Brocklesby, Water-lane, Great Tower st  
 Woodward, John, Tipton, Stafford, Beerhouse Keeper. April 8 at 3  
 at offices of Travis, Church lane, Tipton  
 Wort, James, Birmingham, Lamp Dealer. April 11 at 3 at offices of  
 Fallows, Cherry st, Birmingham  
 Wyane, Thomas, Waterloo, nr Liverpool, Builder. April 13 at 3 at  
 offices of Knowles, Cook st, Liverpool

## SCHWEITZER'S COCOATINA,

Anti-Dyspeptic Cocoa or Chocolate Powder.

Guaranteed Pure Soluble Cocoa of the Finest Quality, with the  
 excess of fat extracted.

The Faculty pronounces it "the most nutritious, perfectly digestible  
 beverage for Breakfast, Luncheon, or Supper, and invaluable for  
 Invalids and Children."

Highly commended by the entire Medical Press.  
 Being without sugar, spice, or other admixture, it suits all palates,  
 keeps better in all climates, and is four times the strength of cocoas  
 thickened yet WEAKENED with starch, &c., and IN REALITY CHEAPER  
 than such Mixtures.

Made instantaneously with boiling water, a teaspoonful to a Break-  
 fast Cup, costing less than a halfpenny.

COCOATINA A LA VAMILLE is the most delicate, digestible, cheapest  
 Vanilla Chocolate, and may be taken when richer chocolate is pro-  
 hibited.

In tin packets at 1s. 6d., 3s., 5s. 6d., &c., by Chemists and Grocers.  
 Charities on Special Terms by the Sole Proprietors,  
 R. SCHWEITZER & CO., 16, Adam-street, London, W.C.

## EDE AND SON

ROBE MAKERS



BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT,

To Her Majesty, the Lord Chancellor, the Whole of the Judicial Bench  
 Corporation of London, &c.

SOLICITORS' AND REGISTRARS' GOWNS.

BARRISTERS' AND QUEEN'S COUNSELLORS' DITTO.

CORPORATION ROBES UNIVERSITY & CLERGY GOWNS.

ESTABLISHED 1649.

94. CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

**MONEY.**—Profit believed to be certain; no calls,  
 no partnership, and no real risk.—£1,000 is REQUIRED  
 to secure a monopoly in this and other countries, where there are  
 large armies; £500 will be retained by the advertiser, and £500 will  
 be left in the hands of the person finding the money for the purpose  
 of paying the expenses of securing the monopoly in joint names;  
 none, however respectable, need fear to reply, as he will meet  
 with his equal in that respect.—Answer with real name and address,  
 W. 31, at C. H. May & Co.'s General Advertising Offices, 78, Grace-  
 church-street.

**LAW.**—A Solicitor, who has taken his B.A. degree  
 at Cambridge, was articulated, and remained for a year as  
 managing clerk in a large City office, and has since had three years'  
 experience in an office at the West End of London, desires a Manag-  
 ing Clerkship. Is competent to undertake the Conveyancing, Chan-  
 cery, or Common Law Departments.—Address, Lex, care of Steel  
 & Jones, Advertising Agents, Spring-gardens, S.W.

**LAW.**—WANTED, for an Office in the Country, a  
 Clerk conversant with the Country Practice of Chancery and  
 Common Law, and the Drawing of Residuary and Succession  
 Accounts, and Settlement of Costs.—Apply by letter, stating age,  
 salary required, and previous engagements, to A. B., 14, Southamp-  
 ton-street, Bloomsbury.

**LAW.**—Conveyancing Clerkship, under slight  
 supervision, WANTED by a Gentleman, (M.A., passed, but  
 not yet admitted). Country preferred.—Address, E. B., J. O.  
 Taylor & Sons, Norwich.

**LAW.**—Engagement Wanted, by the Advertiser, as  
 Assistant Common Law and Chancery Clerk in an office of  
 extensive practice. Age 26. Moderate salary. Good references.—  
 Address, H. W., care of Hunsford & Co., 5, Middle Temple-lane, E.C.

**LAW.**—Conveyancing.—A Gentleman, thoroughly  
 conversant with, and able to conduct without supervision,  
 desires a Re-engagement as Managing Clerk.—Address, Mr. W.,  
 care of G. Reader, Esq., 23, Holborn-viaduct.

**A SOLICITOR**, who has been for nearly Three  
 years a Managing Chancery Clerk in one of the largest  
 London offices, and having a good knowledge of Conveyancing and  
 General Practice, wishes to meet with a Partnership in town or  
 country.—Sicma, Reynell & Son, 44, Chancery-lane.

**WANTED** by a Solicitor (Camb. M.A.), admitted  
 in 1878, a Re-engagement as Conveyancing Clerk under  
 slight supervision. Good references.—Address, J., Keston Rectory,  
 Beckenham.

**HAMPTON & SONS make NO CHARGE** for  
 inserting particulars in their FREE MONTHLY REGISTER  
 of ESTATES, TOWN and COUNTRY HOUSES, Furnished or  
 Unfurnished, or for Sale, to be had GRATIS at their Offices, or  
 post-free for two stamps. Published on the 1st of the month, and  
 particulars for insertion should be sent not later than five days  
 previous to end of preceding month.

Valuations for Probate and Transfer. Surveys.

Estate and Auction Offices, 8, Pall Mall East, S.W.

**MESSRS. BAXTER, PAYNE, & LEPPER** beg  
 respectfully to announce that their AUCTION SALES of  
 Estates, Building Land, Ground Rents, House Property, and all  
 convertible Securities will be held at the MART, TOKENHOUSE-  
 YARD, E.C., on the following days during the year 1881. Sales  
 will also be held on special days when required.

Tuesday, April 12

Monday, May 2

Friday, May 20

Wednesday, June 8

Monday, June 20

Friday, July 8

Monday, July 25

Wednesday, Aug. 10

Wednesday, Sept. 14

Wednesday, Oct. 12

Monday, Nov. 7

Wednesday, Dec. 14

Terms on Application. Auction Sales of Furniture, Farming  
 Stock, Growing Crops, Timber, Underwood, &c., by arrangement.  
 Property Register, together with a separate List of Farms, pub-  
 lished monthly, and forwarded gratis on application.

BAXTER, PAYNE, & LEPPER, 69, King William-street, E.C., and  
 Town Hall, Bromley, Kent.

## SOUTH COAST, at a Favourite Watering Place.

Improving Investment, suitable for a Gentleman wanting a  
 very healthy house with mild climate, and yet profitable occupation  
 for his time and capital. Well-built HOUSE and SHOP PROPERTY,  
 producing over £700 per annum; constructed by the owner (a  
 landed proprietor), and for SALE at its actual cost, together with  
 valuable BUILDING LAND, capable of very profitable develop-  
 ment. Price about £20,000, of which about two-thirds may remain  
 on Mortgage. Other property would be taken in exchange for a  
 portion of the balance.—Plans may be seen and particulars obtained  
 of Messrs. DOWSETT & WOONS, 70, Lincoln's-inn-fields.

## ROTHERHITHE.

Valuable Freehold Wharf Properties on the Thames, close to the  
 principal entrance of the Surrey Commercial Docks. With pos-  
 session.

**MESSRS. FULLER, HORSEY, SONS, & CO.**

are instructed to SELL by AUCTION, at the MART, Token-  
 house-yard, on WEDNESDAY, MAY 11, at TWO precisely, in Two  
 Lots, an important FREEHOLD PROPERTY, situate in Rother-  
 hithe-street, Rotherhithe, and comprising:—

Lot 1.—The extensive Waterside Premises, known as Trinity-  
 wharf, having the large frontage of 224ft. to the River Thames by  
 an average depth of 130ft., and an area of about 29,300 square feet,  
 for many years in the occupation of Messrs. R. B. Hyatt & Co., as  
 their bottled beer stores. The buildings are extensive, and consist  
 of a spacious range of three substantial brick-built warehouses and  
 stores, having a frontage of 224ft. to Rotherhithe-street, with loop-  
 hole doors on each floor, and two large warehouses or stores ad-  
 joining and communicating with the preceding, fronting the wharf.  
 The total floor space is about 42,000 square feet.

Lot 2.—A valuable Freehold Wharf adjoining, having a frontage  
 to the River Thames of 121ft., by an average depth of about 123ft.,  
 and possessing an area of about 15,000 square feet, suitable for a  
 timber or coal wharf, or for the erection of warehouses or granaries.

Possession will be given on completion of the purchase.  
 May be viewed till the sale by orders to be obtained of the Auc-  
 tioneers. Printed particulars, with plans, may be had of Messrs.  
 Janson, Cobb, & Pearson, Solicitors, 41, Finsbury-circus, E.C.; at  
 the Mart; and of Messrs. Fuller, Horsey, Sons, & Co., 11,  
 Billiter-square, E.C.

## TO INVESTORS.—Circular of Investments, just

ready, containing useful information, and showing how a  
 large income can be secured by the purchase of French Rentes,  
 without liability or possibility of loss. A small deposit only re-  
 quired on the amount of purchase. Speculative accounts opened on  
 most favourable terms.—Address, WHITE, BARKLEY, & Co., Brokers,  
 20, Change-alley, Lombard-street, London.

## A PROFIT RENTAL OF £210 a Year, increasing

in three years to £250 a year, and in seven years to £310 a  
 year, to be sold. The property consists of Shops and Premises,  
 chiefly on lease, the remainder on agreement for lease. The term is  
 25 years. Two thousand pounds will be accepted.—Address, V.,  
 Charles Taylor's Advertisement Offices, 154, Fleet-street, E.C.

## RETIRED OFFICERS, Capitalists, and others.—

A Gentleman, having a large business, Requires about £300  
 for extending same. Professional money-lenders not treated with.  
 Full investigation and highest references offered. This will be  
 found a good investment.—Address, O. A. C., at Horncastle's, 61,  
 Cheapside, E.C.

## A LONDON FIRM of Land Agents, Surveyors, and

Auctioneers have a Vacancy for an Articled Pupil.—Apply,  
 F. C., Messrs. E. E. Croucher & Co., 76, Chancery-lane, W.C.

## CHANCERY LANE.—New Courts Chambers, 57

and 58, Chancery-lane.—Offices to be let in above building at  
 rents varying from £30 to £300 per annum.—Further particulars at  
 Inquiry Office, Nos. 57 and 58, Chancery-lane, W.C.



## MELBOURNE, VICTORIA.

**THE TRUSTEES, EXECUTORS, and AGENCY COMPANY (Limited).** Incorporated and empowered by special Act of the Parliament of Victoria, No. 644, intituled "An Act to confer Powers upon the Trustees, Executors, and Agency Company (Limited)."

## DIRECTORS.

The Hon. SIR CHARLES SLADEN, K.C.M.G., Chairman.  
D. McARTHUR, Esq., late Inspector Bank of Australasia, Vice-Chairman.

John Benn, Esq. (Grice, Sumner, and Company).  
The Hon James Balfour (E. Henty and Company).

F. R. Godfrey, Esq.

W. Templeton, Esq., Managing Director.

Subscribed capital liability, £150,000, with power to increase up to £1,000,000.

Bankers—Bank of Australasia, Melbourne, and its Branches.

This Company is empowered in its corporate capacity to act as trustee, executor, or administrator, receiver, committee under the Lunacy Statute, or as agent for trustees, executors, or administrators, or for principals, who, from absence, ill-health, or other causes, are unable or unwilling to act for themselves, and in this capacity will receive and pay over, as directed, legacies, annuities, dividends, rents, interest on debentures or mortgages, and will buy, sell, or let landed property, &c.

The Company will also invest money, negotiate loans, buy or sell shares, effect insurances, and act generally as agent, as well in Melbourne as in country districts.

The Company derives its profits entirely from commission business, a very important element in estimating its security.

Any further information can be obtained at the office of the Company's agents in England, Messrs. Sladen & Mackenzie, 1, Delahay-street, Westminster, Solicitors.

## THE LONDON ASSURANCE

(Incorporated by Royal Charter, A.D. 1759.)

FOR FIRE, LIFE, AND MARINE ASSURANCES.

Head Office:—No. 7, ROYAL EXCHANGE, LONDON, E.C.

## WEST END AGENTS,

Messrs. GRINDLAY & CO., 55, Parliament-street, S.W.

Governor—WILLIAM RENNIE, Esq.

Sub-Governor—GEORGE L. M. GIBBS, Esq.

Deputy-Governor—LEWIS ALEXANDER WALLACE, Esq.

## Directors.

H. Gough Arbuthnot, Esq.

Robert Burn Blyth, Esq.

William T. Brand, Esq.

Edward Budd, Esq.

Major-General H. P. Burn.

George W. Campbell, Esq.

Mark Wilks Collet, Esq.

George B. Dewhurst, Esq.

Robert Gillespie, Esq.

Howard Gilliat, Esq.

Henry Gochen, Esq.

Edwin Gower, Esq.

A. C. Guthrie, Esq.

Percival Lewis Hambro, Esq.

Robert Henderson, Esq.

Louis Huth, Esq.

Henry J. B. Kendall, Esq.

Charles Lyall, Esq.

Greville H. Palmer, Esq.

Capt. R. W. Pelly, R.N.

P. F. Robertson, Esq.

Robert Rytie, Esq.

David P. Sellar, Esq.

Col. Leopold Seymour.

## Solicitors.

Messrs. Johnsons, Upton, Budd, & Co., 20, Austinfriars, E.C. & Messrs. Collyer-Bristow, Withers, Atkey, 50, Austinfriars, E.C. & Russell, 4, Bedford-row, W.C.

NOTICE is hereby given that the fifteen days of grace allowed for renewal of Lady-day Policies will expire on 9th April.

The Directors invite applications for Agencies for the Fire and Life Departments.

Prospectuses, copies of the Fire, Life, and Marine Accounts, and all other information can be had on application.

JOHN P. LAURENCE, Secretary.

## PROVIDENT LIFE OFFICE

FOUNDED 1806.

50, REGENT STREET, and 14, CORNHILL, LONDON.

Existing Assurances exceed .. .. .	£6,500,000
Invested Funds .. .. .	2,124,711
Annual Income .. .. .	279,852
Claims Paid exceed .. .. .	6,500,000
Bonuses Declared .. .. .	2,342,000

During the past year (1880) each main item has shown improvement upon the preceding year.

	1879.	1880.
New Premiums .. .. .	£15,172	£18,845
Income .. .. .	273,084	279,852
Invested Funds .. .. .	2,077,215	2,124,711

CHARLES STEVENS, Secretary.

## GENERAL REVERSIONARY and INVESTMENT COMPANY.

5, Whitehall, London, S.W. Established 1836. Capital, £200,000.

Chairman—EDWARD WALMSLEY, Esq.

Deputy-Chairman—Colonel J. W. J. OUSELEY.

The business of this company consists in the purchase of, or loans upon, reversionary interests, vested or contingent, in landed or funded property or securities; also life interests in possession, as well as in expectation.

Prospectuses and forms of proposal may be obtained from the Secretary. WM. BARWICK HODGE, Actuary and Secretary.

## GUARDIAN FIRE AND LIFE OFFICE

11, Lombard-street, London, E.C.

Established 1821. Subscribed Capital, Two Millions.

## DIRECTORS.

CHAIRMAN—AUGUSTUS PREVOZOT, Esq.

DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN—JOHN G. TALBOT, Esq., M.P.

Henry Hulse Berens, Esq.

Henry Bonham-Carter, Esq.

Charles Wm. Curtis, Esq.

Charles F. Devas, Esq.

Sir Walter R. Farquhar, Bart.

Alban G. H. Gibbs, Esq.

James Goodson, Esq.

Thomson Hankey, Esq.

Richard M. Harvey, Esq.

Rt. Hon. John G. Hubbard, M.P.

Frederick H. Janson, Esq.

Rt. Hon. G. J. Shaw Lefevre, M.P.

Beaumont W. Lubbock, Esq.

John B. Martin, Esq.

Hy. John Norman, Esq.

David Powell, Jun., Esq.

Henry Vigne, Esq.

MANAGER OF FIRE DEPARTMENT—F. J. Marsden.

ACTUARY AND SECRETARY—T. G. C. Browne.

Share Capital at present paid up and invested ... £1,000,000

Total Funds, upwards of ... £2,981,000

Total Annual Income nearly ... £500,000

N.B.—Fire Policies which expire at Lady-day should be renewed at the Head Office, or with the Agents, on or before the 9th day of April.

ESTABLISHED 1851.

## BIRKBECK BANK.—

Southampton Buildings, Chancery Lane.

Current Accounts opened according to the usual practice of other Bankers, and interest allowed on the minimum monthly balances when not drawn below £25. No commission charged for keeping Accounts. The Bank also receives money on Deposit at Three per cent. interest, repayable on demand. The Bank undertakes for its Customers, free of charge, the custody of Deeds, Writings, and other Securities and Valuable; the collection of Bills of Exchange, Dividends, and Coupons; and the purchase and sale of Stocks and Shares. Letters of Credit and Circular Notes issued.

A Pamphlet, with full particulars, on application.

FRANCIS RAVENSCROFT, Manager

31st March, 1880.

## ABBOTT'S LAW

RELATIVE TO

## MERCHANT SHIPS AND SEAMEN.

In Six Parts.

- I.—Of the Owners of Merchant Ships.
- II.—Of the Board of Trade—Local Marine Boards—Mercantile Marine Offices and Naval Courts.
- III.—Of the Persons employed in the Navigation of Merchant Ships, and of the Conveyance of Passengers.
- IV.—Of the Carriage of Goods in Merchant Ships.
- V.—Of the Hiring and Wages of Merchant Seamen.
- VI.—Of General Average—Salvage—Collision—and Maritime Liens.

By CHARLES, LORD TENTERDEN, Late Chief Justice of England.

Twelfth Edition.

By SAMUEL PRENTICE, Esq., of the Middle Temple, one of Her Majesty's Counsel.

Price £2 2s.

London: SHAW & SONS, Fetter-lane, E.C.

## MR. BANISTER FLETCHER'S VALUABLE TEXT BOOKS

Arranged in Tabulated form, and fully indexed for ready reference. LIGHT and AIR, with methods of estimating Injuries, reports of most recent cases, &c. Twelve Diagrams. Crown 8vo, cloth, 6s., post-free.

ARBITRATIONS, with Appendix of Forms, and List of Schedules. Crown 8vo, cloth, 5s., post-free.

COMPENSATIONS, with Appendix, giving Forms of Precedents and Valuation Tables. Crown 8vo, 5s., post-free.

B. T. BATSFORD, 52, High Holborn, London, or of any Bookseller.

The PRELIMINARY, INTERMEDIATE, and FINAL (Pass and Honors) EXAMINATIONS.

MR. ALBERT GIBSON, Solicitor (Honors).

Author of "Aids to the Final," "Aids to the Intermediate," "Guide to Stephen's Commentaries," &c., &c., has classes reading for these Examinations throughout the year, except for one month during summer. Postal preparation also. Two residential pupils received.—For terms apply to 35, Southampton-buildings, Chancery-lane, or St. Mary Gray, near Chislehurst.

[N.B.—At the January Final out of 22 pupils sent up 20 passed, 4 taking Honours, including the Clifford's-inn Prizeman.

Since January, 1880, out of 60 pupils sent up for the Intermediate, 52 passed at their first attempt, and out of 24 sent up for the Preliminary, 23 so passed.]

OFFICES.—To Solicitors.—Old Jewry Chambers, four rooms, first floor, and Fire Proof Room, with immediate possession; rent £205.—Apply, B., Housekeeper, 10, Old Jewry Chambers, E.C.

OFFICES.—Chancery-lane, in a Modern Building, on Ground-floor, Two large Rooms, communicating. Rent £100 per annum.—Apply to Messrs. Moss & JAMESON (late Price & Son), Auctioneers and Estate Agents, 48, Chancery-lane.